69777

The Christian East

FOREWORD

BY HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

NOW, as always, the difficulty which besets the inter-relations of the Anglican and Eastern Churches is the absence on either side of accurate knowledge of the facts.

The publication of this Review will, it is hoped, go far to remove that obstacle.

As knowledge "grows from more to more," we shall find respect and even reverence on either side grow in proportion.

For this reason I welcome the periodical publication of such pages. They should be helpful both to our Eastern friends and to ourselves.

I wish the enterprise Godspeed.

RANDALL CANTUAR.

LAMBETH,
February 2, 1920.

WAR-TIME CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND THE CHURCH OF RUSSIA

By the Rev. G. K. A. BELL

THE last five years have been notable for a considerable growth in the communications which have taken place between the Church of England and the Churches of the East. There had been correspondence before, both official and semi-official—indeed, ever since the beginning of the seventeenth century. Friendly visits had also taken place on both sides. It is, however, roughly true to say that communications between the Anglican Communion and the Orthodox Eastern Church have hitherto been limited in range, and somewhat formal and even ceremonial in character; and that there had hardly been any communications between the Church of England and such national Churches of the Orthodox Communion as the Greek, Serbian, and Roumanian. The events of the War have made a great change. The Anglican Communion has been brought into touch with the Orthodox Eastern Communion as a whole.

It is the purpose of this article, and of a subsequent article, to give some record of one particular field in which the expression of this sympathy and the evidence of this remarkable growth of intercourse between the two Churches may be traced.

Between 1914 and 1920 a series of communications have passed between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the East. The communications have been various in character, and come from many different parts of the world: from many different Churches of the Orthodox Communion, and from the separate Churches of the East. Thus, to mention some of the Churches which in different ways have been in correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury during the War, letters or messages have reached Lambeth from the *locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople; from the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria; from the Patriarch of Moscow and other Bishops in the Church of Russia; from Esthonia; from the Serbian Orthodox Church; from the Metropolitan of Athens, the Archbishop of Trebizond, the Archbishop of Cyprus, the Metropolitan of Moldavia and Succava; from the Nestorian Patriarch of the East; and from many more. With some of those named there has been a more or less continuous correspondence, owing, as a rule, to special reasons, such as the reception and instruction of theological students in English Universities or elsewhere. With others an immediate need led to a letter, or message, either to or from the Archbishop of Canterbury.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY NEW YORK

It is proposed, therefore, to give some account of the more important of the communications which have been received at Lambeth during the past five or six years, together with copies of the messages themselves or extracts from them. In the present paper the subject will be the correspondence of the Archbishop of Canterbury with the Church of Russia.

During the first three years of the War no actual letters passed between the Archbishop and the authorities of the Russian Church. But from the first the Archbishop was kept well informed with regard to the ecclesiastical position at Petrograd and Moscow, notably by the assistance of the late Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, whose knowledge of Russia was unique. The hopes which waxed with the appointment of M. A. D. Samarin as Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, in succession to M. Sabler, in July, 1915, and waned with his resignation the following October; the growing influence of the Siberian Rasputin; the lessening authority of the Tsar; the relation of the Duma to the Holy Synod; the history and character of Pitirim, Metropolitan of Petrograd—all these find their reflection in the papers at Lambeth. At the close of 1916 a new era was seen to be approaching. The Revolution was at hand. Many forces combined to bring it to pass, extreme reactionaries joining with extreme radicals, though with very different objects in view. The first conspicuous event, inaugurating the new epoch, was the murder of Rasputin, December, 1916. Then came the momentous series of events in the first days of March, 1917, culminating in the imperial ukase suspending the Duma on March 12, 1917, which the President, M. Rodzianko, refused to obey. The Tsar was absent with his armies at the front. The troops at Tsarkoe Selo went over to the Revolution. The Tsar himself, despite repeated warnings, failed to turn back to Petrograd till too late. Three days later he was deposed, and signed the historic decree of abdication, with its pitiful close, "God help Russia," on March 15, at Pskov.

The inauguration of the first Revolution, which has been described by some as an event vying in importance with the War itself, was also the moment for the first direct communication between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Church of Russia. On April 15, 1917, the Russian Easter Day, the Archbishop sent the following message by telegram to the Holy Synod:

"To the Holy Synod of the Church of Russia.

"On behalf of the Church of England I exchange with you, at this sacred season, the fraternal greeting of thanksgiving and hope. Christos voskress.

"May the blessing of the risen Lord 'fill you with joy and peace in believing,' even amidst the anxiety and strain of this eventful year.

"May the strife and the confusion issue in a righteous victory over the high-handed wrong of our enemy, and in abiding peace and freedom for the peoples of Europe.

"May the Russian people, in its newborn strength, be guided by the Holy Spirit of God to bear therein a worthy part. The Easter benediction rests to-day upon our great peoples, united under new conditions by bonds of ever-deepening sympathy and friendship. Christos voskress.

"RANDALL CANTUAR."

April 15, 1917.

This Easter greeting duly reached the Procurator of the Holy Synod, and was published in the Russian Press; the Archbishop of Canterbury learning later, from a Russian source, that it received a cordial welcome.

There can be no doubt that the position of the Russian Church, during the first months of the Revolution, was difficult in the extreme. Some of its most prominent leaders, prior to the Revolution, had been deeply committed to the Tsarist régime, and had gone far to identify a large portion of the Church with an illiberal, not to say obscurantist, policy. Again, apart from all questions of politics, it is clear that the internal life and organization of the Church was in urgent need of reform. There were many who recognized this, and a progressive group was in existence—a group, the hopes of which had risen high when M. Samarin was appointed Chief Procurator in 1915. It is interesting to note one very significant policy on which the minds of this group were set: the restoration of self-government to the Church, with a certain measure of control still vested in the State. This policy is prominently put forward in an article from the *Tserkovny Viestnik* (Church Messenger), the Journal of the Petrograd Ecclesiastical Academy, July 16, 1915, on the appointment of M. Samarin as Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod: "The problem of the moment is, above all, to set free the fettered conciliar forces of the Church, and thereby to recover the very possibility of the Church acting for itself. But to restore the conciliar system ('Sobornosti'), of course, means limiting the part which the authority of the State has taken upon itself since the time of Peter the Great. The conciliar system excludes State guidance (although it does not exclude State control), and genuine conciliar government [the system of 'sobors' or 'councils'] will not be realized until the State renounces the undertaking fastened upon it by Peter the Great."

In 1915 and 1916 little was possible on these lines. But with 1917 came both the opportunity and, indeed, the necessity for some sort of Church reform, and in particular for the introduction of the conciliar

system. It is significant, therefore, that the second message of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Church of Russia after the Revolution should be a message of deep fraternal interest in the great task of reform to which the Russian Church had set itself, and of prayer that the spirit of wisdom might guide the counsels of the Church in the performance of that task. The message was dated September 11, 1917, when the deliberations of the "Great Sobor," or Council, at Moscow were still proceeding; though, owing to the difficulties of communication, there was some delay in the delivery of the message It ran thus:

"I desire on behalf of the Church of England to convey to the Holy Synod of the Russian Church and to its responsible authorities throughout the land, the assurance of our deep fraternal interest in the efforts which are now being made by the Bishops, Clergy, and laity of the Russian Church to use for the good of the whole people the new opportunities which—even in the present turmoil—have arisen: and to express our firm hope and the promise of our confident prayer that it may please God Almighty, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to grant to the whole Church in Russia the spirit of wisdom and strength at this time of crisis and difficulty and hope.

"RANDALL CANTUAR."

September 11, 1917.

There was one most significant step which the "Great Sobor" had not yet taken when the Archbishop's telegram was despatched. This step may be described as the final act in the reversal of the system imposed upon the Church by Peter the Great. It was the revival of the Patriarchate of Moscow after nearly 250 years, and the enthronement of the newly-elected Metropolitan of Moscow, Tykhon, in Moscow Cathedral on December 4, 1917, as Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

The new Patriarch was a man in the prime of life, fifty-two years old. The son of a priest in the Diocese of Pskov, he had been successively Candidatus Theologiæ in the Ecclesiastical Academy in Petrôgrad; teacher, inspector, Rector of the Ecclesiastical Seminary at Kazan; and then Bishop, first of Liublin, and then for the Aleutian Islands, with his residence at San Francisco. After a period of some years in America, Tykhon returned to Russia. He became Archbishop in 1905, and from 1913 held the Sees of Yaroslav and Lithuania. In June, 1917, he was elected Metropolitan of Moscow by the popular vote, and in December he became Patriarch of All Russia. In character he is described by those who knew him as shrewd, sympathetic, ascetic, tolerant. He is also said to be a keen student of scientific questions. His attitude to the Church of England is stated to be one of cordial interest and friendship. It is worth noting that, in connection with the re-establishment of the Patriarchate of Russia, the Ecclesiastical Council of Moscow, at its meeting on December 14, 1917, passed a

resolution "that steps should be taken to enter into relations with the Episcopal Churches of Great Britain and America in order to bring about closer relations between those Churches and the Russian Church."

The third message, therefore, from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Russian Church, was with peculiar appropriateness a message of congratulation to His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, on the occasion of his election to the Patriarchate:

"To His Holiness Tykhon, Patriarch of All Russia.

"I desire in the name of the Church of England to send to your Holiness our respectful and fraternal greeting on your election to the ancient Patriarchate of Russia. It is to the Christian Church united throughout the world in the bonds of our Holy Faith that mankind must look in hours of darkness and confusion for light and healing. We assure your Holiness of our unfailing prayer that the hand of our Living Lord may rest upon you in blessing, that the Holy Spirit may guide you in thought and word and act, and that you may be strengthened to discharge to the glory of God and to the good of His people the high and sacred duties in the Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to which in the revival of the Holy Patriarchate you have at a time of difficulty and anxiety been solemnly called.

"Randall Cantuar."

Lambeth Palace,
December 17, 1917.

This message was duly handed to His Holiness, at a special audience appointed for the purpose, by the British Representative at Moscow, with as much ceremony as the circumstances permitted.

The Patriarch immediately sent the following reply, in English, written with his own hand, and with the signature in purple ink:

†

2 Cor. i. 3-5.

"To His Grace Randall Cantuar, Archbishop of Canterbury, etc.

"Your Grace,

"We beg to acknowledge the receipt of your kind message with the greetings in the name of the Church of England on our election to the Patriarchate of Russia.

"Permit us to express our sincere gratitude for your fraternal feelings and our profound wish that your prayers, which are of great value and moral comfort to us at this hour of general anti-Christian spirit in the world, may fulfil, and all Christians unite in strong fight for the glorious banner of our Faith—Holy Cross of our Saviour.

"It makes us happy to know that the Church of England keeps the Russian Church close to her heart, and in the name of the Holy Orthodox Russian Church we ask you to accept our warm appreciation of your belief, which we here fully share, that 'it is to the Christian Church united throughout the world in bonds of our Holy Faith that mankind must look in this hour of darkness and confusion for light and health.'

"Therefore, let us pray that the vial of wrath of God may yet spare humanity, and that 'for the elect's sake' these days of tribulation may be shortened, and general misfortunes of nowadays may teach all branches of Christianity to approach nearer one another in the Spirit of love and unity.

"Our blessings to all. With the best wishes and cordiality, we are, Sir, faithfully yours,

"✝ TYKHON, *Patriarch of All Russia.*"

Moscow,
January 12/25, 1918.

It is no exaggeration to say that these two messages, with the circumstances in which they were written taken into account, mark a moment of much importance in the relations between the Church of England and the Church of Russia.

The months which followed were fateful for Russia and for the Russian Church. The effect of the Bolshevik *coup d'état* soon made itself felt. One of the first acts of the new Government was to disestablish and disendow the Church. All Church property was nationalized, and all connection between Church and State brought to an end. In answer to these decrees, the Patriarch appealed to all Christians to oppose the Bolsheviks with might and main, and formally excommunicated the entire Bolshevik Party. The position of the Patriarch, although apparently exposed to every sort of danger during the succeeding months, was nevertheless extraordinarily strong. He denounced the execution of the deposed Tsar as "a crime without a name." In October, 1918, on the first anniversary of the Bolshevik *coup d'état*, he issued his famous denunciation, which began and ended with the text, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." But fearless as his denunciations have been, the Bolsheviks have not dared to injure him. He was arrested once, but almost immediately released. His moral authority within Moscow, and indeed throughout Russia, grows steadily; nor can the exercise of mere force shake it.

We have spoken with such fullness of the three first messages of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Church in Russia, culminating in the reply from the Patriarch Tykhon, because in these messages the Archbishop was in communication with the central authority of the Russian Orthodox Church. Since early in 1918, however, communica-

tions with Moscow have been difficult, if not impossible; and no further correspondence has passed.

It will be well to pass now to the messages which have been received at Lambeth from the Church in different parts of Russia since the letter from the Patriarch. We can deal with these much more briefly. Their meaning is very plainly set upon their face. They are cries for help. This in itself is a fact of striking significance. In their bitter distress Bishops and clergy and laity of the Orthodox Church appeal for the support and the prayers of the Church of England. We can give them as they come.

The first is from Odessa, and arrived at a time when any communication at all from that town was almost a miracle. It is dated December 30, 1918, and runs as follows:

"ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, LONDON.

"I fervently beg your Eminence to protect the Orthodox Russian Church. The Revolutionary Government is subjecting it to cruelties by the side of which the persecutions of the Christians in the first three centuries pale. Many Archbishops, hundreds of priests, have been martyred and shot. The Churches are profaned and pillaged. On December 18, Antony, Metropolitan of Kiev, was arrested without reasons and taken we know not whither. All my efforts to liberate this innocent martyr led to nothing. I implore your Eminence and your body of Bishops to save the Metropolitan from the hands of his persecutors and the Church from the frightful agonies (*angoisses effroyables*) which she is enduring.

"PLATON, *Metropolitan of Odessa.*"

The Archbishop replied in the following telegram:

"HIS EMINENCE PLATON, METROPOLITAN OF ODESSA, ODESSA.

"The Church of England sends her deep sympathy to the Russian Orthodox Church in the trials and dangers through which she is passing. The terrible persecutions and martyrdoms detailed by your Eminence awake profound emotions in the hearts of the Christian people in this country. I am doing all I can, and meanwhile assure you of the prayers of our Bishops and people.

"RANDALL, *Archbishop of Canterbury.*"

At the same time the Archbishops of Canterbury and York recommended subject to diocesan sanction the use of the following prayer in church:

> "O God our Refuge and Strength, Who art a very present help in trouble, have mercy, we beseech Thee, upon the Russian Church in her hour of need. Deliver her by Thy most mighty protection from the dangers that beset her, and grant her people rest; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

The next message was an appeal from Omsk, received February 12, 1919:

"To the Most Rev. His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

"We, the Supreme Administration of the Orthodox Church in those parts of Russia which have been liberated from the power of the Bolsheviks, venture to humbly beg your Grace's attention to the following: Having seized supreme power in Russia in 1917, the Maximalists [*i.e.*, the Bolsheviks] proceeded to destroy, not only the cultivated classes of society, but have also swept away religion itself, the representatives of the Churches, and the religious monuments venerated by all. The Kremlin Cathedrals of Moscow and those in the towns of Yaroslav and Simferopel have been sacked, and many churches have been defiled. The historical sacristies, as well as the famous libraries of the patriarchs of Moscow and Petrograd have been pillaged. Vladimir, Metropolitan of Kieff, about twenty Bishops, and hundreds of priests have been assassinated. Before killing them the Bolsheviks cut off the limbs of their victims, some of whom were buried alive. Religious processions, followed by great masses of people, at Petrograd, Toula, Kharkoff, and Soligalitch, were fired upon. Wherever the Bolsheviks are in power the Christian Church is persecuted with even greater ferocity than in the first three centuries of the Christian era. Nuns are being violated, women made common property, licence and the lowest passions are rampant. One sees everywhere death, misery and famine. The population is utterly cast down and subjected to the most terrifying experiences. Some are purified by their sufferings, but others succumb. Only in Siberia and the region of the Ural mountains, where the Bolsheviks have been expelled, is the existence of the civil and religious population protected under the ægis of law and order. It is with the most profound sadness that we acquaint your Grace with the misery from which millions of real Russians are suffering. In the name of human solidarity and in a spirit of Christian brotherhood, we trust that we shall be able to count upon your Grace's compassion. We hope that as the representative of the Christian Church in Great Britain you will, with your followers, turn to Him who holds life and death in His hands, with ardent prayers for those in Northern Europe, who for the love of Christ have in the twentieth century been martyred for their Faith.

"Sylvester, *Archbishop of Omsk, President of the Supreme Administration of the Orthodox Church*; Benjamin, *Archbishop of Simbirsk*; Father Vladimir Sadovsky, and Professor Pissareff, *Members of the Administration*."

This message was read in the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury, which was sitting at the moment; and the Archbishop,

in replying (as the Bishop of London, speaking in the name of all, assured him) expressed the whole-hearted sympathy of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury. The following was his answer:

"*February* 13, 1919.

"To His Beatitude Sylvester, Archbishop of Omsk, Omsk.

"I have received with the deepest distress the message in which your Beatitude and those who sign with you describe the appalling trial and the cruel suffering to which the clergy and people of the Russian Church are now being subjected. The Bishops and their flock on whose behalf you appeal to me may be assured that no effort shall be wanting on our part to arouse in the public mind a realization of the terribleness of these things, and to promote by every means in our power any measures of relief which the Governments of the Allied Powers may find to be practicable. We pray God, through Jesus Christ, that in some way there may be provided for you a happy issue out of these afflictions. "Archbishop of Canterbury."

Once more a specially urgent telegram came from Archangel, dated September 1, 1919, pleading with the Archbishop of Canterbury to use all the influence he had to prevent the withdrawal of British troops from Archangel:

Archangel, *September* 1, 1919.

"The clergy and Orthodox Christians of the town of Archangel venture respectfully to address your Grace, and in your person the Christians of England, requesting you to accept their greetings of brotherly love in Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, and the following expression of the feeling of affliction which greatly troubles the Archangel Christians, and of hope which they put in the English Christians. Last August the great British nation, with its Allies, following the Christian dictates of its heart heard the sufferings of the Russian people, and sent the northern region its active help, by means of which Archangel was delivered from the cruel and inhuman yoke of the Bolshevik terrorists. Since then during a whole year the citizens of Archangel have lived in safety and peace, under the protection of the military power of a noble nation, serving the Lord God unhindered and labouring for the satisfaction of its daily needs. With all their heart they thanked the Lord God for it and the great British nation and its Allies. Their gratitude was all the more sincere that they well knew the horrors of life under the bloody yoke of the Soviet power in those parts of the northern region which are still under that yoke. The population perished in great numbers and continues to perish by the hands of the Bolshevik robbers. Plundered of its last means of existence, and with inexpressible pain in its heart, having to suffer the sacrilegious defilement of God's Churches and the cruellest persecution of its

spiritual pastors, of whom several in our district have already shed their blood as martyrs for the faith of Christ. But now, in the last days, terrible tidings have spread through Archangel and the whole northern region. The British troops are said to be recalled within a short time from here to their country. The population of Archangel knows well what terrible consequences would follow the withdrawal of the British military forces before the firm union of the divided parts of the Russian people was completed for the purpose of struggling successfully with the Bolshevik violators alone without external fraternal help. The departure of the British forces from Archangel at present would mean that the Soviet troops would come here, and the Bolsheviks, driven out a year ago, with all the more frenzy madly longing for vengeance, would throw themselves on the peaceful population which had shown gratitude to its deliverers. They will defile our sanctuaries, rob our Churches, illtreat our spiritual pastors, insult our wives and daughters, and take away our dwellings and all that is essential to the maintenance of life, and in addition there will not be many to whom the plunderers will leave life itself. In this solemn hour when such a fiery trial approaches, the Archangel Christians, putting their faith in God pray to Him as one man that, merciful to His people, He should shield them from the storm that is ready to burst over them, that He, the ruler of men's souls and bodies, should support and strengthen still more in the hearts of the English Christians the holy feeling of brotherly love towards the Orthodox Christians in Archangel. The citizens of Archangel and of the whole northern region place their hope in the Lord that the noble hearts of the English Christians will be filled with sympathy for us who are in such great need, for our salvation from approaching evil, of strong brotherly help. They hope that the English Christians wishing greatly to help their brothers will tell their Government that it is still too soon to deprive the northern region of brotherly help, but that it should be left there until after the storm has passed and the Russian people's position has become clear, and it will itself be able to defend its safety and its sanctuaries. The clergy and Christians of Archangel cherish the hope that the English Christians will not spurn this prayer of theirs for help in time to save God's sanctuaries from defilement, and God's peaceful people from the horrors of starvation and destruction. We have chosen the Archpriest of the Archangel Cathedral, John Leluchin, to express the above sentiments and hopes, and recommend him to the care and love of your Grace.

"Signed on behalf of the clergy and Christians of Archangel,

"PAUL, *Bishop of the Archangel Diocese*,

"ARCHPRIESTS TEHEKAN, MELETIEFF, LEGATOFF,

"CITIZENS LAOUSHKIN, POPEFF, SOKEROFF, KERJAVIN, AFANASIEVA, ISADSKAYA, KOSTILEVA."

(Original with signatures on several pages.)

The telegram was followed up by a personal visit paid by the Archpriest of Archangel Cathedral, Father John Leluchin, to the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace on September 25, 1919. Father John Leluchin spoke at length to the Archbishop on conditions at Archangel, and brought him also a letter from the Archimandrite Benjamin, Abbot of the Solovetsky Monastery, together with an ikon.

The Archbishop handed Father John Leluchin the following letter to take back with him to Archangel:

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E. 1.
September 26, 1919.

"TO THE RIGHT REVEREND PAUL, BISHOP OF ARCHANGEL.

"RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR BROTHER,

"I have had the great satisfaction of receiving your representative—Father John Leluchin, Dean of the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity in Archangel—and of having full conversation with him about the conditions now prevailing in Russia. I have thus been brought into close touch both with your Grace as Bishop of Archangel, and with the Abbot and other authorities of the Solovetsky Monastery, whose reputation is so familiar to us all. In sending to you by his hands this letter, I desire to assure your Grace, and through you the members of the Russian Church on whose behalf you write, that in England prayers are everywhere being encouraged and even enjoined on behalf of our Christian brethren in Russia who are subjected at present to conditions of grave suffering and anxiety.

"We have confidence in the stability in Russia of the Holy Faith which is common to our Churches. It is the voice, as we know, of the great multitude of the Russian people who are striving in the Name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to maintain for the whole nation and its life the Truth which has come down to us during the long centuries of the Church's history and which is more powerful than any force which the world can create.

"Whatever may at this time be the political difficulties which beset our statesmen in regard to the large questions which are at issue, and whatever the confusion, and even the dismay, which prevail at this time of strife and unrest, we believe firmly in a great future for the Russian people. Russia may be assured of England's prayers and of England's profound sympathy in every effort which Russia can make to strengthen in the people of that great country the principles which come to us from Christ Himself, the Prince of Peace. We well know that these principles will in the end prove victorious, notwithstanding any tribulations or distresses which must first be undergone.

"I know that I can write on behalf of many besides myself when I

assure you of my own earnest desire to use every opportunity which may present itself for awakening sympathy with the Russian Church and people in this time of difficulty, and no effort shall be wanting on my part to help your Grace and the flock committed to you in any way that I rightly can. We know that we can at least help you by our earnest and expectant prayers.

"I have the honour to be,

"Your faithful brother in Our Lord Jesus Christ,

"RANDALL CANTUAR."

The Archbishop wrote a further letter of thanks to the Abbot and the Chapter of the Solovetsky Monastery. In due course the Archpriest reached Archangel, and on January 27, 1920, the following message was received at Lambeth:

"TO HIS GRACE THE MOST REVEREND ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, LAMBETH PALACE, LONDON.

"The Christians of Northern Russia have heard with great joy and satisfaction your message conveyed to Paul, Bishop of Archangel, of the 26th September last. We pray for your Grace's happiness and welfare of your community. We sincerely request you and your English brothers not to forget us with your prayers, help, and sympathy in these times of hardships and danger. Your Grace's message will be widespread among our Russian people.

"Per pro Community of Archangel, clergy, and laymen:

"PAUL, *Bishop of Archangel*; CHEKAN, *Archpriest, Chairman of Community of Clergy and Laymen*; JOHN LELUCHIN, *Archpriest of Archangel Cathedral*; ARCHPRIEST ORLOFF; CITIZEN SHAPOSHNIKOFF; CAPTAIN LOWSHKIN."

The above letters and telegrams are the chief messages which have passed between the Church of Russia and the Archbishop of Canterbury in the last five years. Other matters have from time to time given rise to correspondence, direct or indirect, but the most important of the direct communications have now been given. It may, however, be fitting to refer to one particular incident, not mentioned hitherto, in which the Archbishop of Canterbury was concerned. A special appeal was made to the Archbishop in August, 1919, by the Russian colony in Belgrade, supported by the Synod of all the Orthodox Serbian Dioceses, asking him to take steps to secure the release of three Russian Bishops—Antonius, Metropolitan of Kieff; Eulogius, Archbishop of Volhynia; and the Suffragan Bishop Nikodimus. The two first-named had been arrested by the Ukrainians at Kieff, then transferred, with Bishop Nikodimus, to the custody of the Polish Government, and kept in strict

confinement in a Roman Catholic convent near Cracow. The Archbishop, in answer to this appeal, brought the facts to the notice of the authorities. The necessary enquiries were made, and early in September the Archbishop was able to tell those who had approached him "that the three Bishops have already been released." A few weeks later the further satisfactory information came from a Russian source that the three Bishops had duly arrived at Rustoff Don.

The present position is obscure. Such information as percolates by devious routes to this country indicates that the Patriarch's authority is very great and does not diminish; and that the churches are crowded with worshippers. There seems, however, to be one change of the greatest importance, a change of which the full significance, and indeed its application to ourselves, has certainly not been realized in this country. The Patriarch has issued a Pastoral,[1] dated September 25, 1919, from the Troitzky Monastery, expressing his grief for "the horrors of this bloody struggle between the warring parties," but definitely asserting that the suspicion of secret counter-revolution on the part of the clergy for the downfall of the present Soviet regime is unjust, and that "the establishment of one or other form of government is not a matter of the Church, but of the people." The Pastoral ends with these words:

"Remember also, Fathers and Brothers, the Canon Laws and the commands of the Holy Apostles (1 Pet. ii. 13): do not give any occasion to justify the suspicions of the Soviet Power; submit to their orders, so far as they are not contrary to your faith and conscience, since, according to the Apostolic injunction, God must be obeyed more than men. Consecrate all your efforts to the spreading of God's Word, the truth of Christ's significance in our days of Godlessness and infidelity. And may God's love and peace be with you for ever. Amen. (2 Cor. xiii. 11)."

February 2, 1920.

[1] Though it is difficult to obtain absolute proof at present of the genuineness of any document given to the public by wireless telegraphy or otherwise, and although the versions made public contain some differences of verbal detail, there does not seem to be reason for doubting the authenticity of the Pastoral.

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE UNDER THE BOLSHEVIKS

By the Very Rev. Professor CONSTANTINE AGEIEV

[Note.—This was written in the spring of 1919. The author, himself a prominent personality of the Russian Church liberation movement, professor of divinity, was elected a member of the All-Russian Church Council of 1917, and belonged to the progressive group of the Council which worked in close collaboration with the Patriarch Tykhon. The testimony of such a man therefore acquires special interest and value for the study of Bolshevism in its relation to religion in general and the Russian Orthodox Church in particular.]

PRIOR to the Revolution of 1917, the Russian Orthodox Church was in an extremely precarious position. Under the guise of protecting the Church, the State in reality had enslaved it. The autocrat Tsar was, in fact, the all-powerful head of the Church.

The consequences of such a state of affairs were defined by the great Dostoievsky, a devoted son of the Church, in a general formula, termed in the words well known to all: "The Russian Orthodox Church is in a state of paralysis."

Paralysis leads gradually and surely to the dying of the whole organism, and had Dostoievsky lived during the last pre-revolutionary years he would certainly have found a different wording to characterize the state of Church life in those days.

The results of the "State captivity" of the Orthodox Church may be concretely expressed in the following main theses:

1. The Orthodox Church has become, not in its essence, certainly, but as regards its acting representatives, a servant of the State, and, moreover, of a definite form of government. The activity of the Church has greatly taken a political, and what is more, a one-sided character.

2. In connection with the historical struggle begun long ago between the Russian intelligentsia and the autocracy, the aforesaid relation of the Church to the State led to the estrangement of the Russian educated classes from the Church.

3. The Church, being unnaturally bound to the State, was unable to instil the true teachings of Christ into the minds of the people, as it was obliged to keep and act as a servant of Autocracy.

4. The activity of the Church on the above lines caused a schism inside the Church itself between the upper and the lower clergy (between the episcopate and the secular clergy).

5. The Orthodox Church, enslaved by the State, has necessarily

lost its character for activity as regards its purely Church work, and its initiative, having given over the management of its worldly affairs into the hands of the State.

I am writing these lines in the heat of Russian Bolshevism, this mixture of bestiality and Russian sivukha (bad vódka), (the definition belongs to P. B. Struve). Rivers of blood, shed over the area of the whole former territories of Russia, under the temporary order of things, are the visible consequences of the Russian Revolution. . . . And yet I may say without hesitation that the Russian Revolution freed not only the people, but the Russian Orthodox Church likewise.

On August 15, 1917, the sittings of the All-Russian Church Sobor (Council) began in Moscow, the Sobor which the Russian Tsar had been vainly implored to convene during the last years. The sittings ended in September 1918.

With the meeting of the Church Council in 1917, a new epoch was opened in the history of the Orthodox Church.

The All-Russian Church Council was, as regards composition, a true expression of the principles on which the Church Council should meet. It represented in due proportion all the elements of the Church: bishops, priests, and laymen. And the variegated composition of the laymen showed that the love to the Church, and the desire to arrange the conditions of its life, embraced all classes of the Russian Orthodox community; side by side on the same benches sat professors, schoolmasters, landed proprietors, magistrates, peasants, and workmen.

History must judge the work done by the All-Russian Church Sobor, but I am convinced that, as regards problems carried out by it, history will class it on the same level as Œcumenical Councils.

The problems before the Sobor, if judged from the strictly religious standpoint, were very moderate. It was necessary to arrange anew the exterior side of Church life, starting from the top, from the head of the Church down to the lowest: namely, the primary groupings of Church life, the parishes. The problems to be solved by the Sobor belonged to the kind of work done by Martha in the Scriptures. But it is well known that this work has a very small significance in the development and normal course of Church life.

The All-Russian Church Sobor created normal exterior conditions of Church life; and this newly-prepared chalice should now be filled with the water of life, and given a sober-like religious inspiration.

According to the decisions passed by the Sobor, and which have now become a law, the outward formation of the Church is, in its main points, as follows:

At the head of the Church stands the Holy Synod (consisting of twelve bishops) and the Supreme Church Council (consisting of twelve members—bishops, priests, and laymen). Both these bodies have at

their head the elected Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, at present represented by His Holiness the Patriarch Tykhon.

Each of these bodies has its special work under its jurisdiction, whereas the most important and responsible questions are decided by a joint session of both the bodies.

The diocesan and parochial administration is similar to that of the higher ecclesiastical institutions. In the dioceses, ruled by a bishop, there is a council consisting of priests and laymen, and in the parishes a parish council, consisting of elected parishioners, with the parish priest at their head. Between the administration of the dioceses and that of the parish there is a council of provosts to serve as an intermediary.

Besides this, juridical reforms, organization of the Church economy and the parish statutes have been drawn up in all details.

A separate section of the work of the Sobor is given to the definition of the powers and functions of the Patriarch.

While juridically at the head of the highest Church administration, the Patriarch may at the same time under certain conditions be arraigned by this administration and tried by the Church Sobor: the All-Russian Church Sobor being, in virtue of its collective resolutions, the highest legislative and administrative body.

The whole formation of the Church is imbued with one high, religious idea, that of the Sobor as a collective body, so definitely revealed in the Holy Scripture and the Holy Gospel.

The work of the All-Russian Church Sobor took place at a time when Bolshevism was at its height in Russia.

Bolshevism stopped the development of Church life in Russia, and the Sobor resolutions have not yet been properly put into practice.

I have now reached a period of Russian history so important for its significance and consequences that I have to dwell on it:

"A mixture of Russian savagery and Russian sivukha" (bad vodka), is how P. B. Struve, a well-known professor in Europe, has defined the substance of Russian Bolshevism. This definition is correct, and at the same time insufficient; however simple and disgusting Russian Bolshevism is in its crude primitiveness, we cannot abstain from attempting to understand it and to try and find an explanation for the reason of its existence.

"Socialism is not only a workmen's question, or of the so-to-say fourth category, but it is by preference an atheist's question, a question of the contemporary incarnation of atheism, a question of the Tower of Babel, which was being built precisely without the aid of God not to reach the heaven from the earth, but to bring heaven down to the earth," wrote Dostoievsky, with ardent conviction. "European liberalism and even our Russian liberal dilettantism, have often con-

fused the final results of socialism with those of Christianity. This is a barbarian conclusion, and certainly a characteristic feature," he repeatedly says with much emphasis.

With certain reservations, I myself wholly agree with Dostoievsky. These reservations are as follows:

We should distinguish between certain principles of socialism, dealing with the arrangement of the life on earth and meant for themselves, and socialism as an entire all-embracing understanding of the world. Socialist principles in themselves are the machinery for the arrangement of life, and in this their acceptance may be merged with the most various conceptions in life. But socialism, as an all-embracing world conception, excludes any other idea beyond that which is included in its teachings.

The history of human understanding knows only one form of socialism, as that pertaining to the entire world conception—namely, the socialism of K. Marx and Engels, the so-called "scientific socialism"; as it is formulated in the theoretical part of the Erfurt programme; that socialism which in sociological literature is termed "Revolutionary Marxism," "Marxism of Absolute Demands," "The Utopian Marxism." This socialism of Marx, which will not admit of any compromises, must, according to the idea of its founders, be everything to the man: both his faith and his practical life. Socialism so conceived must inevitably come in collision with religion, which also claims to grasp the whole man; and Marx was quite consistent when he declared irreconcilable war on all religion, and on Christianity in particular. Religion is pernicious, as a visionary illusion distracting human thought from actual evil; religion is like opium to the people: such is the real thought of Karl Marx and Engels. According to the true saying of the Russian historian of socialism, Professor P. I. Novgorodzev, complete denial of religion was not only the profoundest philosophical conviction of absolute socialism, but also its chief tactical policy. The followers of Marx, and even the most straightforward of them, Liebknecht and Bebel, proclaimed religion to be a "private affair," and have thereby ordained a certain neutrality with regard to religion. "Social democracy in itself has nothing to do with religion:" this was Liebknecht's maxim.

And Bebel explained himself still more explicitly with regard to this neutral position to religion. "Had we entered into a struggle with the Church," he said, "our party would have turned into a kind of Church Sobor." Such assertions, however, on the part of Marxists is a treason to true Marxism. Marx would never have said that social-democracy has nothing to do with religion; he would say that it must conduct an incessant struggle against religion. And it was probably just the religious question which caused Marx to say about Bebel and

Liebknecht: "These gentlemen are nonentities in theory and good-for-nothing in practice: they wish to make socialism, and chiefly the social democratic party, more moderate, and to enlighten workmen, having only confused notions themselves. . . . They all are neither more nor less than wretched counter-revolutionary babblers."

Hence socialism, as understood in the form of absolute Marxism, is an active irreconcilable enemy of religion in general, and Christianity in particular.

The socialistic principles taken separately are in my opinion rooted in the foundation and theory of a correctly organized State, inasmuch as it observes the principles of justice, and in this acceptance they are not only unopposed to Christianity, but may be considered as generated by it.

Scientific socialism (Marxism) understands a man only from the material point of view; for this reason nothing was truer to Marx and Engels than the words of Feuerbach, when he said: "Man is what he eats." Man is an animal, a tree, a piece of earth; there is no difference substantially between them: such is the simplified, but perfectly correctly formulated philosophy of socialism, and certainly only the most simple-minded would seek for points of contact between Christianity and this socialism.

Bolshevism is, at its best, a Utopian absolute Marxism, and to such an extent uncompromising, that Bebel and even Liebknecht are styled by its adherents as "compromisers," and "social traitors." In Russia the many adherents of this socialism consisted of uncultured workmen, and soldiers who have been for long ages kept in the demoralizing school of slavery. And if in addition we bear in mind the special features of the Russian mentality, of which I shall speak later, we shall begin to understand the nature of Russian Bolshevism which has so widely blossomed all over Russia in 1919.

The nature of a Russian is sphinx-like, has been said long ago. "I cannot bear to see," says Dostoievsky through the lips of the uneducated Mitia Karamazov, "how a man with a heart above the ordinary and a superior mind begins by setting up a Madonna as his ideal, and ends by descending to the depths of Sodom. And what seems to me more awful still is that, with the thought of Sodom in his feelings, he finds a place in his heart for the vision of Madonna, and it is burning for her, and really and truly burning as at the time when he was an innocent youth. No, man is too broad, much too broad; I would make him narrower." These words of Dostoievsky may be to a great extent applied to the Russian mentality, taken in its primitive state.

Anyone who had occasion to observe a Russian peasant could not fail to be struck by the abnormal union in his soul of a tendency to holiness, extending to martyrdom, with bestiality approaching sadism.

A Russian robber who slaughtered a whole family and refused to drink milk on a Wednesday is a true type of Russian nature. Systematized cheating and stealing and, at the same time, fervent prayers; animal life, and then suddenly conversion and carrying ascetism to the verge of exhaustion, is the diapason of life of a Russian peasant.

A European differs substantially from a Russian. A long period of many years of civilization, in some places the penetration of Christian principles which have been, moreover, taken in consciously, have all levelled, as one might say, the nature of a European, and makes it more steadfast in following one direction. The Russian peasant is different. Here we have a primitive nature left intact; it is the element of a nation undoubtedly strong by nature. Civilization has not touched him. Religion, alas! has never penetrated to the depth of his soul: many will have to answer for this before the Lord: Stemka Rasin arose before the whole world in his enormity.

Imagine now the seeds of revolutionary Marxism falling on the ground of such a primitive nature, of that Marxism which in its source is permeated with the principle of class enmity, not only as a sociological principle, but also an empiric experience, joined with a hatred to the propertied class. What was this absolute socialism to generate in the nature of a Russian peasant soldier? I remember hearing once in the heat of revolution one soldier in a railway-car saying to another: "Why should one not kill a man if one likes? We kill a chicken; where is the difference?" Such is the simplified philosophy of economics and materialism. And again, I have to think of the eternal words of Dostoievsky: "To my mind there is nothing to destroy even," says the double of I. F. Karamasov—the devil. "You have only to abolish in mankind the idea of God; that is where you should begin." This done, the whole mankind without any exception, will deny the existence of God; the whole former view of the world will vanish itself without any cannibalism, and chiefly the former morality, and then everything new will begin by itself.

I consider Karl Marx to be the evil genius of the whole world. His chief guilt towards mankind lies in the fact that he has set up the state of things in the world as if it were the law of universal life, and this has especially its significance in respect to the fundamental dogma of Marxism, the principle of class warfare.

With my conception of Christianity I do not believe in the kingdom of God on earth. Christ's disciple Paul, in his strongly expressed words in chapter vii. of his Epistle to the Romans, illustrates to us the nature of man as consisting of two elements: the element of good and that of evil, which are ever struggling with each other. And I believe that the soul of an individual human being and of entire human groups will continue to be the field of such a struggle to the end of the world.

Such is, however, the actual state of affairs. The law of universal life is the striving to conquer evil, to vanquish the kingdom of evil by the kingdom of good; such, likewise, is the sense of the hourly prayer of a Christian: "Thy kingdom come." This religious standpoint gives an absolutely definite direction to the entire dynamics of life.

Karl Marx has taken a diametrically opposite point of view. The struggle between the two groups of mankind—viz., the kingdom of evil—he recognized to be the normal state of affairs, and set it as a principal form of law.

If we call the religious point of view the Divine origin, then the view founded and formulated by Marx should be called the Satanic origin! Scientific socialism is, as it were, a knife plunged into the body of mankind which has divided it for ever into unjoinable parts.

Extremely simply—so much so that it even frightens one to think of it—has this part of socialism been assimilated by Russian Bolshevism; but, however surprising it may seem, nobody has hitherto, maybe, approached so near the true spirit and idea of Marxism as precisely the Bolshevik.

In their immediate understanding of the Marxist dogma of class-war the leaders of Bolshevism in no wise differ from the lower elements. The inhabitants of Petrograd will remember that from the time of the Bolshevist rising in July, 1917, the motto inscribed on all their banners was: "War until final victory against the bourgeoisie." The Bolshevist conception of this war can be judged from an official Bolshevist proclamation: "So long as one landowner, capitalist, or officer remains alive, the socialistic Fatherland is in danger." One may judge of the effect of this gospel of class-war in the villages, on the minds of the war-weary soldiers, on the workmen wronged by the injustice of social conditions. I myself chanced to be present at a peasant meeting in a large village where I had often spent my summer holidays officiating and preaching in the church, and whose inhabitants, I knew, were well disposed towards me. They were a patriarchal people, whom I had studied closely for fifteen years and knew well, beginning with the chairman of the meeting, who had been churchwarden for many years. And I was welcomed to this meeting as an old and respected friend. But never—either before nor since—have I ever experienced such a creepy sensation as during that couple of hours, although I have often been present at labour meetings in the towns. When the chairman spoke of the struggle against the bourgeoisie, pronouncing that word in a manner all his own, and when I looked at the hot, perspiring faces of the packed audience, I simply felt my hair stand on end.

This simple, unusually good-natured and well-disposed Little Russian peasant, seemed turned into a beast poisoned by the hashish of class hatred. And that in the Ukraine. While in Soviet Russia the whole

of Great Russia has become one military camp. There ruthless internal warfare has permeated every village, every family. Constant fighting is going on in the villages between the working peasants, branded as "k[illegible]i," and the ne'er-do-wells, styled the village paupers. One frequently meets families where the father is Bolshevik, the mother non-political, and the sons are fighting against the Bolsheviks in the ranks of the volunteer army. Such was the transformation which the principle of class-war underwent in the mentality and life of a Russian socialist. And all this is far from being as naïve as it may seem to a person brought up amidst the surroundings of a long-standing civilization. Two such men as Dostoievsky and Hertzen—men standing at opposite poles in their conception of the world, but both of them great men in their genius of foresight—are as one in their denial of the reasonableness of any loving relations between man and man, outside the pale of supernatural religious foundation. There is nothing upon the whole earth which compels human beings to love one another; there is no such natural law that man should love man; and if love ever existed or still exists upon earth, it exists not because of any natural law, but solely because of mankind's belief in immortality. The whole natural law consists in that, were mankind's faith in immortality destroyed, not only would all sources of love in their hearts, but all the living forces of the world would be retarded. Not only will nothing be considered immoral, but everything will be allowed —even anthropophagy. Yet even this is not enough; to every private individual, disbelieving in God and his own immortality, the natural law of morality must at once be transformed into the counterpart of its former religiousness, and selfishness, reaching even to crime, shall not only be permitted to mankind, but even acknowledged as the wisest, most necessary, and even the noblest, issue. Read the "Omnia mea mecum porto" in Hertzen's confession, "From the Other Shore," and you will see the same thing: there exists no law of nature ordering the love of mankind. The Bolsheviks in Russia, under conditions unparalleled in the history of the world, when the fullness of power was in their hands, have made the experiment of eradicating the idea of God from the soul of the people. Need we wonder that many have rushed along that path which has led to the horrors of the present day.

"The masses," says Hertzen, "are filled with secret longings and passionate impulses; with them ideas are as one with fantasy; with them it does not, as with us, remain a theory; with them it immediately passes into action." And therefore the whole story of Bolshevism became immediate action with all its consequences.

The responsibility for all the horrors of Bolshevism in Russia lies upon its ideological leaders. They could not but know that their government would give no other result. They could not but know

could have no shadow of doubt, that by proclaiming terror, by organizing "pauper committees," they set the ones to stab the others. And it is my profound conviction that mankind as a whole will be unworthy of its name—nay, more, it will itself be not far from the Bolsheviks—if it passes by all the horrors that are taking place throughout Russia, if it does not make those responsible who, in the twentieth century, have renewed in Europe executions of the innocent for the guilty, who have introduced tortures before which the darkest episodes of history of the world pale.

Are the people guilty? Yes, in so far as one is justified in accusing any rude elemental force which in its impetuous rush destroys all obstacles found upon its path. One may perhaps hate it, but this would be an elemental psychological impulse rather than the voice of sober wisdom. In relation to the people, my attention is particularly attracted by the manifestations of an incomprehensible sadism. Let them kill, shoot! But wherefore these unnecessary outrages and mockery?

But a Christian should not be surprised even by such manifestations. We seem to forget the tragedy of Golgotha; it all happened there, down to the smallest details. I sometimes think that this is a perverted manifestation of human nature; the torturer endeavours to stifle the stern voice of conscience. And no wonder; a wild beast lacerates its victim without thinking of mockery, whereas man acts differently. Where, then, in the midst of all these horrors, is the Orthodox Church? Why have the people, which seemed so faithful to the Church, so easily thrown off the mask, not only of Christianity, but of humanity, and been transformed into beasts? Do not statements as to the complete downfall of any influence of the Church appear to be well founded? These are questions which I know are put by many. It is, however, first of all necessary to eliminate incorrect generalizations, or at least to limit them considerably. In a way, the entire Russian people have become Bolshevist, but only under certain of its aspects. I suppose that all the people willingly accepted the gospel of the land, but certainly not in the socialist sense. It simply means that for many reasons the people had no particular scruples in accepting the proposal of the authorities to divide the landowners' estates. But Bolshevism as a world doctrine remained alien to the masses of the people, having found adepts only among its leaders' nearest collaborators—soldiers, workmen, village hooligans—who cannot be taken into consideration in a general discussion of the question. It is my profound conviction that the mass of the people, even a considerable amount of workmen, have become more religiously conscious—I may even say more actively churchmanlike.

To begin with, we have no information as to any grievous excesses committed in the villages against the Church and her servants by the people proper. Where such excesses did occur, they were instigated by the local Bolshevist authorities, members of the Soviet or the Chresvychaika, who terrorized the village itself. We know of not infrequent cases when the parishioners defended their churches and priests from aggression. Of course, this side of Russian life will only become fully known later; and at present, owing to absence of information from Soviet Russia, one is compelled to judge by fragmentary evidence, but even this is sufficient to justify my words.

I took part in many religious ceremonies organized in reply to this or the other anti-Church decrees published by the Soviet authorities. And these ceremonies give the right to speak of something still greater.

In order to obtain a correct estimate of the people's attitude towards the Church one needs know her exact position in Bolshevist Russia. The decree of separation of the Church and State was issued in January, 1918. During 1918 were published all the other decrees intended to carry out the aforesaid law of principle.

But a decree is one thing. For forming a correct estimate of its meaning one must know the idea underlying the letter, which must necessarily be of a merely general character.

For this latter object I was placed in unusually favourable circumstances. By authority given me by the Supreme Church Government during March-April, 1918, I was delegated as chairman of the educational committee to the Church Commission forming part of a conciliatory commission attached to Sovnarkom (Council of People's Commissaries), of the explanation of the decree for the disestablishment of the Church, and therefore was in constant intercourse with representatives of the Bolshevist authorities. Moreover, as a former educationalist and social worker, I met among Soviet officials some of my old pupils and fellow-workers, who still retained their former confidence in me; I was thus able to learn from them not only what was being said in connection with this or that question, but also the idea underlying the words.

And I firmly assert: the decree of separation of Church and State, or as it was profanely called in official statements the Decree of Liberty of Conscience, is in reality a decree establishing a persecution against the Church—most undisguised and consistent cruelty. To prove this now, after the events of the latter half of 1918, when the Orthodox Church has been crowned with the blood of hundreds of murdered bishops and priests, means forcing an open door. As faithful adherents of the ideology of Karl Marx, the Bolsheviks have declared war to a finish against the Church, stopping at nothing in its realization. And not only to the servants of the Church, but to each of her sons the time has come for the profession of their religion.

And, behold, in such circumstances the village has not vacillated in its attitude towards the Church, but, on the contrary, gives evidence of great activity in the organization of parish life. Suffice to say that the decrees concerning civil marriage, civil registration of births, and abolishing of religious teaching in schools meets everywhere with acute opposition. The religious ceremonies mentioned above, of which I have been an eye-witness both in and around Moscow, were rendered most impressive by the overwhelming numbers of people which took part in them. Processions came from villages situated fifteen to twenty miles from each other, as, for instance, during the visit of the Patriarch Tykhon to the town of Bogorodsk in the Moscow Province. Personally, I frequently preached in various labour centres around Moscow. Large churches, which could accommodate up to 7,000 people, were invariably crowded. . . . My own experiences of lecturing in labour centres (at the Morosov factory) on socialism and its relation to Christianity also brought evidence of an awakening religious consciousness even among the working class.

What could be expected actually did happen; the persecution of the Church brought about the opposite results—the vindication of the eternal saying: the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church.

In the general national religious upheaval, the personality of the elected Patriarch Tykhon has a place apart.

In the cathedral of the Saviour, the Most Holy Tykhon was called upon to occupy the Patriarchal seat by having his lot drawn by a hermit who had renounced the world. And verily the voice of the Lord is visible in this choice. A servant of the Church full of charming modesty and simplicity, indefatigable in his work for the Church, brave unto heroism—from no one else have the Bolsheviks ever heard such stern words of accusation—the Most Holy Tykhon has in these terrible days become the rallying-point, attracting the hearts of all the sons of the Orthodox Church throughout the length and breadth of Russia.

One must have the happiness of personal intercourse with the Patriarch in order fully to appreciate the personal charm of that worthy successor of the Patriarch Hermogenes.

But with all this, the question as to why the Russian Bolsheviks have so easily cast off all Christian image remains in force even if applied not to the Russian people as a whole, but even to its numerous members who have become the servants of the Bolshevist authorities.

To my mind the solution of this question presents no difficulties. But a conclusive answer would take up too much space. Better make it the subject of a separate treatise. Here I will only outline the main ideas which explain it. And in the first place, the above question is not merely a particular question of Russian life. Bolshevism has found

itself a place not in Russia alone. . . . And I fear that this contagion is as yet far from being localized in Europe. Therefore the question itself assumes a general character.

I will put another question. Why has Marxism in its Utopian revolutionary form everywhere and always found fervent adepts? And yet it is Bolshevism itself. I believe I have answered that question in a general way in my brief exposition of the essence of socialism, stated above. If, according to Heine, Heaven is to be given over only to the sparrows, and all man's aspirations come to nothing but the desire of having sweet peas to eat, then Bolshevism is but the lawful outcome of such a conception of the world. If man is but a biped, then, tell me—why should not he become a beast, if that may bring him greater material advantage? . . .

We are, therefore, compelled to speak of human nature generally, and in connection with it of the importance of this or the other conception of the world. The tremendous catastrophe the whole world has just lived through—I refer to the Great War—was the most favourable school for the development of Bolshevism.

War—every war—brings forth heroes of the spirit; that is beyond doubt. But still more does it bring forth biped beasts, who outdo wild beasts in their cruelty.

This is still more applicable to the world war. For the radical socialists had always fixed the world catastrophe, after which would come the socialist millennium, to the time of the world war. The articles of Benin and Zinoviev, compiled together in a volume called "Against the Tide," are particularly characteristic; they contain the most accurate plans for implanting Bolshevism throughout the world. One has but to read their appeals to transform the universal imperialistic war into a similarly universal civil war. . . . What wonder after this, that the Russian soldier and workman, untouched by culture, seized a rifle and, with a light heart, pointed it at his own brother.

Still, as I say, one may speak endlessly of this, and I am but jotting down random ideas. The scope of my report is widening. As the time is short, I will limit it to the most important questions: What is the task of the Orthodox Church in the present crisis, and what must be the attitude of all civilized mankind towards Russian Bolshevism?

Christ has ordered His disciples to "mark the signs of the times," having thus ordered all workers in Christ's field to consider the demands of the times.

The epoch we are now living in is of exceptional importance: it begins a new history of Russia. The Orthodox Church is confronted with a task as great as it is responsible. We have already stated that the source of Bolshevism lies in the negation of all spiritual values, in the bringing down on principle of the whole universe, including man,

to earth alone—the materialistic conception of the world. Religion in general, Christianity in particular, has but one enemy with which it can have no points of contact—and that is materialism. Clearly Bolshevism is absolutely excluded from Christianity, which must declare irreconcilable war against it, certainly a form befitting religion. It may be, and is already being said: the tasks of the Orthodox Church are eternal and unchangeable—there are the teaching and realization in life of Christ's command, and the rebirth of man by the grace of God into a new creature; by achieving this task, the Church thereby likewise accomplishes accessory tasks.

I consider such an answer as moving upon the line of least resistance. It belongs to the category of those commonplaces which, by their very justness, are not very convincing. Each epoch brings its own special tasks. And the great apostles have left us numerous examples of how they adapted themselves to the claims and circumstances of the times in the accomplishment of their fundamental task. I am not urging any change in the fundamental course of action of the Church, but only that of special forms of it in accordance with the commands of Christ.

Our mortal enemy, the Bolshevik, himself teaches the methods of fighting him.

Bolshevism owes its success to the propaganda of its ideas, which is conducted with great skill and energy. Petrograd and Moscow possess special schools and courses of lectures for training agitators. Posters, leaflets, pamphlets have been distributed in our villages. Numerous lecturers do not miss the slightest opportunity of addressing meetings, to say nothing of a large, highly paid staff of Bolshevist missionaries.

The Orthodox Church, in its religious work, must follow the same course.

In their general features, the proposed measures fighting Bolshevism are as follows:

The immediate organization, wherever physically possible, of publication on a large scale; the composition of anti-Bolshevik pamphlets and leaflets; their distribution among the rural population; the formation of cadres of instructors; the propaganda of Christian ideas to supplement the work of parish priests; stirring up the parish priests themselves by means of conferences and courses of lectures for them.

It is necessary to grasp, with every fibre of one's soul, that Bolshevism is an obstinate, dangerous disease. We are apt to put our faith in measures of an external character in fighting Bolshevism, such as hoping for the advent of the volunteer army or the allied tank to overthrow it. A great delusion and very dangerous self-confidence!

Bolshevism will fall outwardly, but will sprout with still greater vigour internally. The fact must be grasped that the Orthodox Church has before it a long and obstinate fight with this disease, and woe to us if even the atrocities committed before our eyes in Soviet Russia do not waken in us a proper love and energy to spread the teaching of Christ among the masses of the people.

Is there any possibility for the Orthodox Church to fight Bolshevism?

First of all, I think that a favourable opportunity is approaching.

Within the limits of Great Russia, or the present Soviet Russia, Bolshevism has, to a considerable extent, spent itself. The experiment of planting absolute socialism has been carried on for nearly two years, and has yielded its proper fruit: in Soviet Russia there are ceaseless insurrections of peasants, and, of late, even of workmen, in one district after another. These revolts against socialism are suppressed with unheard-of brutality by means of Lettish and Chinese mercenaries, but it is clear to everyone who is not blind that the end of the popular false glamour and the beginning of mental sanity is drawing nigh. In particular, there is information to hand that there is a religious revival even among the workmen.

The same process, though, of course, in another form, is going on in Russia as in socialistic Germany, where, among the socialists, there is a longing for faith, a return to the idea of God the Creator (Hans Müller, Wally Zepler).

Furthermore, there is the possibility of a personal struggle against Bolshevism.

Among the clergy a good many men can be found who are sufficiently enlightened and experienced for the propaganda of ideas. The course which it is proposed to start will increase this cadre of skilled workers. Among the more educated classes of the clergy and laity, it will be easy to find and organize a group of special lecturers. There is no need to magnify the task, which is not so great, and the bulk of Bolshevist agitators are less intellectual and enlightened than church preachers, and if they do excel them it is only in energy and persistence.

Now, as regards the other—the literary—form of propaganda, the Orthodox Church is at present in a worse position.

The publication of literature requires the immediate disbursement of a considerable amount of money.

The tragedy of the Church lies in the fact that, with all its colossal wealth amounting to milliards of roubles, it is at present literally beggared: the Bolshevist authorities have deprived it of all its movable property and real estate, not excepting the very churches, and, by their decrees, the Bolsheviks have deprived the Church of the physical possibility of undertaking any economic operations. The Russian

bourgeoisie cannot come to the assistance of the Church, as it is itself without any resources.

There is no government, or even if there is a mere germ, it has urgent problems of its own to solve.

Last year I wrote in detail on this matter; here I merely touch on it. I am convinced that, were England to carry out her last year's intention of helping the Orthodox Church, the work would start immediately in those parts of Russia where it is physically possible to do so.

In conclusion:

In its very essence Bolshevism is a movement of world-wide conquest. As long as it is confined to Russia, it is the merest Utopia, even in the opinion of the very leaders of Bolshevism. Scores of times has Lenin repeated at responsible meetings, in the name of Russian Communists:

"We have lost if Bolshevism does not overwhelm the whole world." Therefore, in order to inaugurate the reign of Communism in Russia, it is necessary that it should be practised all over the world. This is so obvious that it needs no proof. Now, the inauguration of Bolshevism all the world over is only possible by means of a world war: by means of carrying civil war into all the countries of the world. This prejudges the fate of Bolshevism. To start a world conflagration, a new universal war is its only hope. Either Bolshevism itself will perish, or it will make of the whole world what it has made of Russia —that is, it will set up brother against brother, father against son, and son against father.

Bolshevism is a foe not only of Russia and all Europe, but of all mankind. Everyone in whom a grain of human feeling still lingers must turn from this Satanic delusion. And, by the way, I quite understand those people who have fallen into utter despair when some provocatory wireless message announces to the world of President Wilson's supposed negotiations with the Bolsheviks. "Our last hope for mankind is gone," they say.

If it be so, then highly cultured England—whose banner bears the watchword of Humanity shining in the light of Religion, and who is the tried friend of Russia, bound to her by the strongest of ties, by the blood of their sons shed for one common cause—cannot pass by Russia, fainting in her unparalleled struggle with the beast which the world war has given birth to.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY IMAGES[1]

BY ATHELSTAN RILEY

THE great iconoclastic controversy which raged in the Eastern Empire during the last half of the eighth and the first half of the ninth centuries has hitherto been almost neglected by Englishmen. Even in the Middle Ages the Seventh Œcumenical Council (Nicæa II. 787) seems to have been hardly known by English divines, and its famous decree excited but languid interest. Historians like Gibbon treat the controversy with contempt, and to Finlay it was a mere struggle between religion and a superstition, which was both debasing pure and primitive Christianity, and, in its by-products, destructive of the Empire of the East. Anglican theologians, with few exceptions, even if they do not lean towards the iconoclasts, regard the quarrel as a storm in a teacup. But when we come to look closely at the protagonists on both sides we find that the supporters of images were Christian believers, whilst in the iconoclastic camp, alongside of many devout Christians, who thought, no doubt, that they were contending for pure and spiritual worship, were ranged the unbelievers and the opponents of the Christian faith. The quick-witted Greeks seized the point at issue; their subtle intellects guided them unerringly to the centre of the dispute—what was at stake was the very foundation of Christianity, the reality of the Incarnation of the Eternal Word.

What was the object of the Incarnation? The redemption of the world, it will be said, by Christ's sacrifice upon the Cross. The answer is, of course, true, but not by any means the whole truth. It was a condescension to our human nature by its provision of a method by which we might approach God, and it was a hallowing of the images of transcendental things by which we can apprehend them. We are as the good God made us, and our Lord by taking our nature has taught us not to be ashamed of it. We might have been created like the angels, but in His wisdom He made us a little lower: we have bodies which condition our existence and our mode of approach to our Creator. Place yourself in the presence of God for meditation or prayer, and instantly some image, intangible, the creature of the brain and yet wholly material in its conception, rises before you. It is an unworthy and inadequate image, because you, its creator, are unworthy and inadequate to contemplate transcendental mysteries, but it is accepted by God as the best you can offer, and through it He

[1] "Miraculous Icons," *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1919. Being a translation of an article by Meletios, Bishop of Kitium, Cyprus, and now Metropolitan of Athens, in the Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Κῆρυξ.

suffers you to approach Him. "The mind," says St. John Damascene, paraphrasing St. Gregory Nazianzen, "which is set upon getting beyond corporeal things is incapable of doing it. For the invisible things of God since the creation of the world are made visible through images."

It may be objected that these are intellectual images, and a distinction may be sought between them and material ones. It has already been pointed out that these intellectual images are wholly material in their conception; we may go further and ask why the image which is the work of the human organ called the brain should be allowed, and the image which is the work of the human organs called the hands rejected? Did our Lord in His attitude towards images draw any distinction between the intellectual and the material? Clearly He did not; rather is the very condition of our nature taken and extended in the order of grace. The breathing on the Apostles that they might receive the Holy Ghost was a material, not an intellectual, act; that is to say, it was the action of Spirit on spirit through matter. The working of the Spirit under the New Dispensation is closely allied with matter and bound up with images. Our Lord chose water as the material instrument for conveying spiritual regeneration, bread and wine as the matter of the Sacrament of His love. Thus, material things and things of the earth, earthy, were adopted as the channel of communication between God and the human race, as "effectual signs of grace by the which He doth work invisibly in us," by Him who needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what was in man.

What was the effect of the Incarnation? First let us note that, quite apart from God's relation to us, which we will consider in a moment, an Image is of the essence of the Most Holy Trinity, and as such has existed from all eternity. "The Word was the invisible Image of the invisible God," says Origen. By His Holy Incarnation that eternal and invisible Image of God became a visible Image in time. The Word was made Flesh, and the fullness of the Godhead appeared among men bodily. He who was perfect God became perfect Man, not only "of a reasonable soul," but of "human Flesh subsisting." Human Flesh, that is, particles of matter, were taken up with the Manhood into God, and so matter itself through the hypostatic union became the object of worship in the Divine Person as the Body of God, for we cannot worship the Eternal Word, of one substance with the Father merely, but that Word incarnate. Matter in its origin was not an evil thing. Matter can only become evil through contact with evil spirit, as through the Fall. The Incarnation was the appointed remedy of the Fall, and not only raised the dignity of man, but the dignity of matter. Though we go to the utmost limit of theology and even predicate of our Lord one

Theandric operation, yet we must never forget that His human nature is not destroyed or absorbed by His divinity; it is only "taken into God," so that a Body formed out of created and earthly elements is seated on the throne of glory, and men and angels will bow before matter taken up into God, and yet remaining unconfused when quick and dead appear at the last trump before their Judge. The whole relation of matter, both toward God on the one side and toward mankind on the other, has been profoundly influenced by the Incarnation. Matter is the means of man's access to God; if the Jews by Divine direction in the worship of the Tabernacle and the Temple might use the material in worship, *a fortiori* we may do so.

"The darkness is past, the true Light shineth": the true Light that was "made Flesh and dwelt among us." "Perhaps," says St. John Damascene with gentle irony to an objector, "perhaps you are my superior and are lifted up above corporeal things; and being as it were not of the flesh, you make light of what is visible; but as I am a man and clothed with a body, I want to *see*."[1]

And so the eternal, uncreated, spiritual Image stooped to become a visible, created, and material Image in time. He knew the profound limitations of poor human nature, and He came to meet them. He knew the longings of the human heart, and He who implanted those desires came to satisfy them. "That which was from the beginning, which we have *heard*, which we have *seen with our eyes*, which we have *looked upon*, and *our hands have handled*, of the Word of life (for the life was manifested and we have *seen* it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have *seen* and *heard* declare we unto you" (1 John i. 1-3). St. John's words leave no doubt as to the subject of his testimony. He bears witness to a material Image of a spiritual God, and he appeals to three out of the five senses—sight, hearing, touch—in proof of the reality of that Image. And St. John but echoes the testimony of Christ Himself, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (John xiv. 9). "Israel of old did not see God," says St. John Damascene; "but we see the Lord's glory face to face. We proclaim Him also by our senses on all sides, and we sanctify the noblest sense, which is sight." And again: "Of old God the incorporeal and uncircumscribed was never portrayed; but now, when God is seen clothed in the flesh and conversing with men, I make an image of the God whom I see."

[1] It is worth notice in passing, that the elevation of the Host in the Western Church and the popular movement which has arisen recently amongst ourselves for extra liturgical devotion to the Blessed Sacrament are, on one side—they have, of course, another—manifestations of the natural human desire for material, local, and visible objects of devotion. They are, in effect, a reaction against an exaggerated mysticism.

It seemed necessary for the sake of English readers to give some account of the issue which lay at the root of the iconoclastic controversy, and the present writer has done so by drawing largely upon an essay prepared many years ago, the conclusions of which he has seen no reason to revise. And he has long been convinced that the exploration of this field of thought would well repay any competent theologian who would undertake it, and that the full recognition of the part played by images—material, intellectual, and verbal—in the apprehension by our finite intelligence of transcendental realities is a very present help in many theological troubles which perplex the modern mind.

We are told by the present Metropolitan of Athens that the illness of King Constantine of Greece in 1915 was the cause of a manifestation throughout the Greek nation of an extraordinary religious life. The Archbishop notes the "penitential prayers, lasting all day and all night," the people on their knees, even in the streets, litanies and processions, and, lastly, "the carrying of sacred icons and relics of the Saints" to the bedside of the patient. The Metropolitan sees in all this a proof of the religious faith of the nation: he resolutely defends the Church's practice from Scripture and Apostolical tradition. She, "in honouring the Saints in whom God was glorified, and invoking their prayers to God as members of the Church Triumphant, as more perfect brethren of those still living in the world, at the same time honours also the relics of their bodies still left on earth, which, while still united to their souls, were temples of the Holy Ghost. And not only the relics of their bodies, but also the chains with which they were bound for Christ, and their garments and cloaks, and, besides all these, their pictures and the representations of their sacred forms." He then points out how the Church of God, faced with the rejection of images, on the one side, and the "deification" of them on the other, "came forth triumphant," with an exact dogmatic decree "in complete consonance with the fundamental doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God." He quotes the definition of the Synod, and shows how, "teaching dogmatically in the Holy Ghost," it "expressly and categorically makes a distinction between" true adoration according to faith, which is appropriate only to the Divine Nature, and the worship of the icons by way of honour," not referred to the icon itself, but to the person it represents. All this is admirable. He insists that the decree of the Seventh Synod is primarily directed against idolatry by forbidding under anathema any approach to adoration in the reverence or worship we rightly pay to holy persons and holy things. We may add that, as God has encompassed us with images, all ultimately referring to Him, the Church was bound to define our attitude towards them. The Metropolitan finds that some "of the children of the Church, from want of education, and perhaps also from an instinct surviving from

their age-long ancestry, in opposition to the luminous teaching of the Church, take up an attitude towards the icons, not of honour, but of Divine worship." Now this, our Eastern friends must understand, is precisely the danger Englishmen fear in regard to national icons, though, oddly enough, it is the very last error they would fall into themselves, for their religion runs to the opposite extreme; its specific dangers are scepticism and unsupernaturalism. The Metropolitan corrects his flock boldly, but with admirable balance. "Faith in miracle is inseparable from faith in God the Father and in His Providence, who works eternally and directs His creatures to the final aim of creation. It is, moreover, inseparable from faith in God incarnate, whose work is wholly founded on miracle—that is, on the immediate intervention of the Divine power for the occasional suspension of the natural laws." Nor can we accept the view that miracle was relevant and necessary only for the personal work of our Saviour or for the work of His immediate disciples. "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever," and he quotes the promise of our Lord that miracles should follow them that believe, and shows that the facts of miracles are attested in the different ages of the Church by the greatest of our Fathers among the Saints. Clearly, then, the Metropolitan does not blame those who look for miracles, but commends such an attitude as a necessary fruit of faith in God. Nor does he object to the idea that "prayer with fervent faith, in this or that circumstance, before the icon of this or that person, and referred to the person represented, obtains what is asked for in the prayer." The warning to his flock is directed against taking the icons, not as "uplifting the soul to union with the persons represented, but as themselves the source of the Divine power"—a careful statement to which no exception can be taken.

But this statement is differently worded in another passage. The Metropolitan is discussing the popular divisions of icons into miraculous and non-miraculous, and his phrase here is (if the Greek original has been accurately translated) "the idea that the icon itself contains within itself the miraculous property."

If this statement means no more than did the old condemnation of Israel for their idolatry of the Brazen Serpent, when they forgot that "he that turned himself toward it was not saved by the thing that he saw but by the Saviour of all," it cannot be challenged. That this is the view of the Metropolitan seems clear from what he has already said. But let us assume that it is an attempt to draw a distinction between the grace and power of God working through matter in the abstract, and that grace and power working through some particular and circumscribed matter. At first sight, certainly, one looks like faith and the other like superstition. But can this distinc-

tion be validly maintained? Let us pass by the argument from experience, an argument about which both the Eastern and the Western Churches would have much to say. Let us treat it in this way. In dealing with our souls God chooses this instrument and discards that. Nothing is more remarkable than the sort of person, often the most unlikely, through whom He speaks to us. "Reverence all men," said Father John of Cronstadt; "for you know not in whom the Lord will come to meet with you." But it will be said these are living agents—images are dead matter. Under the Old Dispensation case after case can be quoted which shows the selection of matter, and matter in particular forms, as a vehicle of God's power. And when we turn to the New Testament and to the Holy Gospels, which in their presentation of our Lord's teaching must always be the foundation of Christian theology, there is one incident which is extraordinarily to the point. We are informed in the Gospel according to St. John, *as a fact*, that God chose the pool of Bethesda for a remarkable manifestation. An angel at a certain time troubled the water, and the first sick man who stepped into the water after the troubling was healed of whatever disease he had. Let us note the particular selection. First of matter: the water of *this* pool, not of another—one was "miraculous," the other "non-miraculous." Then of time; at a *certain* time the angel went down. And then a further selection; only the *first* that stepped in after the angel's troubling was healed. Now let us try to imagine that this story is told to us by some chance acquaintance, and that it is not familiar to us in the pages of Holy Writ. What should we say of it? What should we think of our informant? To proceed. He who is the Eternal Wisdom of God was standing by that pool; He sees the great multitude waiting for the moving of the water, and He enters into conversation with the impotent man: "Wilt thou be made whole?" The man answers him, explaining how owing to his infirmity he cannot correspond with the grace that he believes to come through the miraculous water. And as our Lord did not interfere with the waiting multitude, so there is not, as we should have expected, one word of rebuke to the impotent man. His righteous wrath does not flame forth against a degrading superstition; there come from His lips only the gracious words, "Rise, take up thy bed and walk."

What, then, is to be our conclusion? Surely this: that there are many things beyond our finite minds, that the Wind of the Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and that—

> "God moves in a mysterious way
> His wonders to perform."

PROSPECTS OF UNION BETWEEN THE EASTERN AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES

By the EDITOR

MANY influences combined in the past to make mutual understanding difficult between the Church of England and the Eastern Church. The obstacles to foreign travel, the barrier of language, the national isolation, the international distrust—all these contributed to keep the two comparatively unacquainted. Here and there a scanty group of scholars understood. Travellers and traders carried news from place to place. But the generality on either side were scarcely more than vaguely aware of each other's existence, and lived their isolated lives in mutual ignorance.

Certainly such ignorance involves on the Anglican side at least a serious loss. For the fact of a great historic Church, whose adherents are said to number 120 million, claiming unalterable fidelity to the immemorial past, and to represent four out of the five Patriarchates of the ancient world, is, to say the least, something which cannot safely be ignored. And when it is realized that this Eastern Orthodox Church is, both in its own self-estimate and in the opinion of its critics, conspicuously conservative and unchanging; and, further, when the type of Christianity which it presents is seen to be both strongly anti-Roman and strongly anti-Protestant, having escaped both the Reformation and the religious developments of the West, we are confronted with a fact not only of immense general significance, but also of peculiar importance to the English Church. For a Catholicism without a Papacy necessarily offers exceptional interest for adherents of the Anglican position.

1. The attitude of Anglicans towards the Eastern Church in the past has been sympathetic and friendly. At least five of the Archbishops of Canterbury have shown marked interest in those venerable Communions. The first was Archbishop Abbot in the time of James I. When Critopoulos was sent by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, to study at Oxford, the English Archbishop supported him there. And it is an important connecting-link between the Churches that Critopoulos subsequently became Patriarch of Alexandria. Archbishop Laud[1] was keenly alive to the importance of an ancient Orthodox non-Papal Church in the Anglican controversy with Rome. In his conference with Fisher, the Jesuit, Laud defended the Greek Church against Bellarmine, and justified it against the Jesuit's criticisms. In

[1] "Conference," § ix. iii.; "Works," 1849, t. ii. 29.

Laud's opinion it was Rome, not the East, which had departed from the Apostolic tradition. Archbishop Wake, whose patristic learning peculiarly justified him to appreciate the Orthodox position, wrote to the Eastern Patriarchs a remarkable letter,[1] declaring: "In every fundamental article we profess the same Faith with you;" expressing also a resolve to hold communion with them, and asking to be remembered by the Greeks "in their prayers and sacrifices at the Holy Altar of God." Archbishop Howley, when the Anglican Bishopric of Jerusalem was founded in 1841, wrote to the Eastern Patriarchs assuring them that the new Bishop was "in no matter to invade the jurisdiction of you, the Bishops . . . in the Churches of the East, but rather to show you due honour and reverence, and to be ready, on all occasions and by all means, to cultivate diligently whatever promotes brotherly love, intercession, and unanimity."[2] The Archbishop went on to speak of "our longing desire to renew the ancient love towards the ancient Church of the East, which has been suspended for ages, which, if restored by the will and blessing of God, may have the effect of healing the schisms which have brought the most grievous calamities on the Church of Christ." Archbishop Benson continued on similar lines, and brought the relationship a stage nearer in the Russian Church. In a letter written in 1888, the Archbishop reminded Platon the Metropolitan of Kieff, that "the Russian and the Anglican Church have common foes. Alike we have to guard our independence against the Papal aggressionism, which claims to subordinate all the Churches of Christ to the See of Rome. Alike we have to protect our flocks from teachers of new and strange doctrines, averse to the Holy Faith which was handed down to us by the Holy Apostles and Ancient Fathers of the Catholic Church."[3]

The deep impression which these words made on the Russian Church is shown in the Metropolitan's reply that it was absolutely necessary that the two Churches should have more complete spiritual union, and requesting Archbishop Benson to inform him on what conditions it would be possible to unite.[4]

2. So far for the historic attitude of the English Church towards the East. We now look to the other side of the picture—the attitude of the Orthodox towards the English Church.[5]

The view of the Easterns used to be that the whole of the West had fallen away, and is in heresy and schism. Protestantism differed from Romanism as being the negative and the positive of the same position, but neither being the true. But as experience brought the Easterns to know something more of the English Church, they have

[1] Quoted by Headlam, "Authority," p. 156.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 159.
[3] "Life of Archbishop Benson," ii. 157.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 158.
[5] *Cf.* "Birkbeck and the Russian Church," p. 233.

shown awareness that the Church of England is separate in principle from Protestantism. They also cannot but appreciate its anti-Papal standpoint, for that standpoint is identical with their own. These facts have awakened their interest and their sympathies.

But they have also had misgivings. Partly because of the vagueness of statement and the inveterate tendency to compromise, which, in their opinion, is the besetting malady of the English Church. Partly because the co-existence of three opposing schools of thought in the Anglican Communion creates in the Orthodox mind a most bewildering impression. Partly also because certain missionaries, both from England and America, have endeavoured to proselytize from the Orthodox and to convert them into Protestants. Partly also because the Easterns have read the history of the English Church through the medium of Roman misrepresentations, which disabled them from appreciating the Anglican position. This last has been particularly effective in the controversy on Anglican Orders.

From all these causes combined the attitude of the Greek to the Anglican has quite naturally been one of caution, of misgiving, of suspicion. There has been an attitude of aloofness and non-committal. They have entered into social and ceremonial relations with Anglicans: but they have felt that reunion was far away, or that it presented difficulties which at times appeared almost insuperable. Yet they have realized that there are great affinities. Their general attitude can be readily seen in the works of two Russian laymen, Khomiakoff and Alexander Kireeff. The former has been brought within reach of English readers by Birkbeck, and both of them mercifully condescended at times to write in French.[1]

There was, moreover, in the general attitude of the Eastern Church in the past a certain unconsciousness of the need of any reform among themselves, which naturally leads to a severe judgment on imperfections seen to exist in other Communions.

As long ago as 1870, Archbishop Lycurgus, Archbishop of Syria and Tenos, gave utterance to very remarkable words on the Anglican claim at a conference held at Ely:

"When I return to Greece, I will say that the Church of England is not like other Protestant bodies—I will say that it is a second Catholic Church, very like our own; and I trust that, by friendly discussion, union between the two Churches may be brought about."[2]

So far, then, for the relations in the past between the Anglican and Eastern Church. There has been a gradual movement towards better mutual understanding. Now for relations in the present. The recent political revolutions have brought the separated Churches closer to one

[1] See Khomiakoff, "L'Église Latine et le Protestantisme," 1872.
[2] See Report of Lambeth Conference of 1888, p. 167.

another, and in a different spirit. The spirit of aloofness and the consciousness of superiority has disappeared. A new necessity for fellowship and mutual support and unity has arisen. There is a wonderful change in the whole outlook of the East. The Greeks "seem to realize that the Eastern Church can no longer stand aloof; that it is now face to face with the West, ill-equipped to solve modern problems, and likely to suffer serious loss from Western propaganda, both Roman and Protestant, unless it can adapt itself to modern needs, and train its clergy to deal with modern difficulties."

It is sorrowfully acknowledged by far-sighted adherents of the Orthodox Church, that, wonderful as is the simple faith of Eastern multitudes, neither their people nor the generality of their teachers are qualified to face the intellectual influences of Protestantism and of Rome, both of which are assiduously directed against their stability, with a force which at times they know not how to resist. We hear on every side that the general education of the clergy in Greece and Russia was exceedingly poor; and that the educated classes stood aloof from the Church's Faith, unable to obtain the guidance which their actively awakened minds require.

We all know how educated Russians residing in Paris seceded to the Roman obedience. How, for instance, Madame Swetchine, a convert from the Russian Church to Rome, devoted her great abilities to the Church of France, is well known to the readers of her correspondence with Lacordaire. And if we may judge from Vladimir Soliviev's "La Russie et l'Église Universelle," the same propagandist influence deprived the Russian Church of one of its most philosophic minds in the nineteenth century.

Hitherto, it has been customary for the abler Orthodox theologians and divinity students to acquire in German universities a culture and a teaching which the East was unable to provide. But, for obvious reasons, the Orthodox will no longer look for instruction to Leipsic or Berlin. If the Easterns' endorse the verdict of the Russian writer Khomiakoff, that German Protestants are "a society of good men, differing in all their opinions, but earnestly seeking for truth, with a total certainty that it has not yet been found, and with no hope that it will ever be discovered,"[1] it is hardly likely that they can feel satisfied and secure under such conditions. "I wonder," wrote Father Nicholai Velimirovic, "I wonder . . . that one of the chief representatives of German Christianity omitted to see how every hollow that he and his colleagues made in traditional Christianity in Germany was at once filled with the all-conquering Nietzscheanism."

The Orthodox cannot look for union with the Protestant communities. Neither can they turn towards Rome, which has ignored

[1] *Cf.* Birkbeck, p. 236.

the jurisdiction of their bishops, set up rival Latin Patriarchates in the East, and weakened them by vigorous and systematic proselytizing. To whom, then, can they look if not to the English Church? It is "the only Western Church which is officially non-proselytizing." Serbia, Roumania and Greece all converge this way. The Archbishop of Trebizond and the Archbishop of Athens have greatly promoted mutual understanding. The entire body of Serbian students for Holy Orders has been placed in the charge of the Church of England. They have held their services in the Chapel of St. John's College, Oxford. The impressive personality of Nicholai Velimirović, Bishop of Zica, has been quite familiar in the pulpits of the English Church, and no one who was privileged to hear him preach under the dome of St. Paul's Cathedral could listen to that powerful appeal for unity between the English and the Eastern Churches without deep emotion and a conviction that a new era had dawned on the relations of the East and West. As the Serbian bishop stood there at the high-altar of that magnificent sanctuary, and gave the blessing to that enormous multitude, it was obvious that the relation between the Churches had passed from mere friendliness, and courtesy into an expression which implies constitutional identity and unity of faith.

And as these actions express agreement on the devotional side, so the series of conferences held during 1918 and 1919 in New York, Oxford, and Westminster, has most impressively shown how close the agreement between the Eastern and Anglican Churches is on the doctrinal side.

In order to promote more effectively the prospect of union, the Archbishop of Canterbury has nominated a permanent committee to be the medium of intercourse between the English and the Eastern Churches. This welcome act must surely mark a historic stage in the process of reunion. It follows on the lines which the Archbishop's predecessors had already taken, but it carries the movement onward into something new. How popular this act has been to the Eastern Church the answer of the Metropolitan of Athens makes abundantly clear.

The Metropolitan says: "Please inform his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece has heard with great pleasure of the formation of a special committee on the relations of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, under the presidency of a theologian of the distinction of Dr. Gore. The Holy Synod of Greece has instituted a similar permanent committee, composed of professors of the Athens University, and presided over by the Archimandrite Chrysostom Papadopoulos, with whom his Grace is acquainted."

The altered attitude of the Greek Church on the subject of Anglican Orders is a conspicuous illustration of all that has been said.

Formerly, Greek theologians and Canonists denied the validity of our Orders, or at best declined to acknowledge them.

And there are instances of reordination.

But it must be remembered that the tendency of Eastern theologians has been to identify the Catholic Church with the Orthodox Church, regarding the two as co-extensive; and then to maintain that, even when the Apostolic Succession has been preserved, yet its grace might be extinguished by heresy or schism. This theory would include all Communions outside the Orthodox, and would therefore be applicable to Roman Orders as well as to Anglican: in which case the Orthodox attitude toward Anglican Orders would give no controversial support to Roman claims.

Moreover, it has been admitted by more recent theologians of the East that the attitude of their predecessors was based on inadequate information as to the conditions of the English Church in the sixteenth century; and also compromised by the fact that they often viewed the English Church through the medium of Roman misinterpretation. There was also a period of exclusiveness and rigidity in which not only were Anglican Orders disputed, but the East would not acknowledge the validity even of the baptisms conferred in the West.[1]

But all this has been gradually and effectively changed.

As Döllinger said some fifty years ago: "The history of religion teaches us to recognize it as to a certain degree an historical law, that great religious contests are carried on for centuries without the solution of the controversy appearing possible; but then a time comes in which the causes which made the strife bitter and a shelving of it hopeless fall away, and then what has been for centuries an impossibility becomes possible."[2]

The Russian professor Bulgakoff, writing in 1898, affirmed of the Anglican hierarchy that "its uninterrupted succession from and connection with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, thanks to the latest historical investigations, must be acknowledged to be undoubted."[3] But that to arrive at a final settlement of the question of the Anglican hierarchy, it is indispensible that the question should be settled of the beliefs of this hierarchy upon the Sacraments instituted by the Lord, to the number of which is "to be referred the Sacrament of Orders itself."[4]

In 1897 Sokoloff, professor at Moscow, was just completing his "Enquiry into the Hierarchy of the Anglican Episcopal Church." In

[1] See Palmer's "Dissertations."

[2] Report of Conference at Bonn, p. 85.

[3] "The Question of Anglican Orders," by A. Bulgakoff, translated by W. J. Birkbeck, M.A., p. 44, 1899. Church Historical Society.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

this work, says Birkbeck, who translated a part of it for English readers, Sokoloff "had not only decided in favour" of Anglican Orders "from the historical and liturgical side, but had torn Leo XIII.'s Bull into shreds, showing that neither it nor the reasons it contained had any significance from an Orthodox point of view. The only doubt was whether the Anglican Church regarded Holy Orders as in any sense a Sacrament. So soon as some representative body of the whole Anglican Church—the Lambeth Conference he suggested—should state that they regarded Holy Orders, though of less significance than Baptism and the Eucharist, as a true Sacrament in the sense of necessarily conveying Divine grace, Orthodox theologians would have no difficulty in acknowledging their validity."[1]

What Sokoloff actually wrote was: "The question evidently comes to this: Is Divine grace undoubtedly communicated to those persons who receive the laying-on of hands, according to the Anglican Order of Consecration and Ordination, or not? Consequently, it will not be possible to speak of the grace-giving significance of the hierarchy in the Anglican Church until it shall be established beyond all doubt that she acknowledges the laying-on of hands to be a Sacrament." Sokoloff accordingly held that some incontrovertible guarantee of this belief of the Anglican Church is indispensable. "But where can we find such a guarantee? Only, it seems to us, in the voice of the Anglican Church herself."[2]

Birkbeck added to Sokoloff's treatise the remark "the next step, therefore, rests with the Lambeth Conference. After all, it does not seem unreasonable that, before coming to the conclusion that Anglican Orders are valid, the Russian" [and we may say Eastern] "bishops and theologians should wish to know in what sense the Anglican bishops themselves believe in them."[3]

The distinguished Russian layman, Alexander Kiréeff, who was chosen to represent the Holy Synod of Russia in dealing with the Old Catholics, and was in many respects in advance of his time, had the advantage of being instructed in English Church affairs by the German historian Döllinger.

With regard to Anglican Orders, Kiréeff had no doubt. "For my part," he wrote, "having listened to the learned Döllinger, and devoted some study to the matter, I accept the Anglican succession as perfectly valid; but the Romanists have so skilfully attacked and calumniated Anglican Orders that their validity is far from being generally held by our Orthodox theologians. Since, however, the Conferences with the Old Catholics and Anglicans, the question has

[1] A. Riley, "Birkbeck and the Russian Church," p. 279, 1917.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 288. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

taken a new direction, and should not present any very serious difficulty. Still it awaits elucidation."[1]

Androutsos, one of the ablest theologians among the modern Greeks, wrote in 1913 a criticism on Anglican Orders, which was published in the *Ecclesiastiké Aletheia*, the official organ of the great Church of Constantinople.[2] He started with the assumption that the Orthodox Church alone is the one true Church, and alone holds the Faith pure and undefiled. He declined to discuss whether separated communions can form parts of the one true Church. Consequently he was unable to consider the validity of Anglican Orders as a corporate fact in the English Church as a whole. All he would consider was individual cases of Anglican clergy applying for admission to the Orthodox Church; whether it was possible in such cases to regard Anglican Orders as acceptable on the ground of expediency, or whether they must be reordained. Androutsos is, of course, aware that he is open to the obvious criticism that if a ministry is actually invalid, to regard it as valid on the ground of expediency is an illogical compromise. But he refuses to admit the applicability of the criticism, which he cannot be said to have refuted. However, within these restricted limits, he discusses the value of the English Ordinal at considerable length, and arrives at the conclusion that, "provided that the High Church party accepts grace as being transmitted in priesthood, and provided it does not hold the Calvinistic doctrine of the Eucharist, nor intends, in any way, to prejudice the priestly character, the dogmatic difficulties of the English Ordinal, studied in humility and Christian love, from an Orthodox Catholic point of view, are capable of receiving a more favourable judgment than the one which they received from Pope Leo XIII."[4]

His cautiously restricted sphere of inquiry leads to a cautiously restricted conclusion. And under these self-imposed limitations little more could be expected to result. But the hesitancy of the conclusions results from the restricted nature of his inquiry.

It is, of course, quite obvious from these limitations, and from their request for a more definite statement by the English Church, that the Eastern Orthodox desire reform in our liturgical expressions.

In 1904, the question was raised whether the American Book of Common Prayer might be adopted for use in a congregation in America which was for the first time conforming itself to orthodoxy. Thereupon the Russian theologians sat in judgment on the Ordinal.[5] They

[1] Novikoff, "A. Kiréeff et l'ancien-Catholicisme, p. 80.

[2] It has been translated into English by Groves Campbell, "The Validity of English Ordinations." 1909.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[5] Frere, "Alcuin Club Tracts," XII., 1917.

held it defective in various ways, but more by its omissions than by its affirmations. They criticized the Preface to the Ordinal. "It does not point out the dogmatic meaning of such an organization of the hierarchy, and does not express any recognition of its divine institution."[1] They regret "this indecisiveness in a question of principle."[2] They see in it "an example of that comprehensiveness which in the judgment of the Anglicans themselves, is a characteristic of their denomination: an expedient which endeavours to reconcile different points of view by avoiding direct issues."[3] They find it "open to the possibility of being expounded in a Protestant sense."[4]

If it were authorized for Orthodox use it would be desirable to bring into it a clear expression of various points, such as the unconditional necessity of episcopal ordination.[5]

This was in 1904. But in 1918 at a conference held in New York the theologians of the Greek Church referred to Sokoloff as the most important Russian exponent of the subject, who, however, was not altogether officially endorsed, and to Androutsos as the chief representative of opinion among the Greeks. It was then declared that "to-day the view current among Greeks everywhere is that Anglican Orders can be recognized without any doubt whatever, as far as the historical point is concerned—namely, that Archbishop Parker was regularly and canonically consecrated, and had the right to ordain others."

But the Greek theologians desired to ask the following question: "Is the Episcopal Church prepared to state whether they do or do not recognize the ordination of the clergy as one of the Sacraments? Because it is not quite clear in reading the Thirty-nine Articles whether the Anglican Church recognizes Ordination as one of the Sacraments or not. Several of the theologians of the English Church state that they do not recognize it." And as far as the Greek theologians know, no statement has come from an official source. "It is for this reason that the Greek or Orthodox Church reserves its opinion on the subject."[6]

A similar question was raised at a conference held in Oxford between Serbian priests and Anglicans. It was stated that while their Canonists long ago had denied the validity of Anglican Orders, subsequent investigation had convinced them that English Orders might be accepted. They said that as far as regards our succession and the satisfactory character of our services there was no doubt. The question was how far we looked upon Orders as a Sacrament? It was stated that the Serbians quite recognized the distinction which Anglicans made between the two Sacraments and the other five. Their own

[1] Frere, "Alcuin Club Tracts," XII., 1917, p. 12. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 14. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 16. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[6] Unpublished Report of the New York Conference.

great theologian, St. John of Damascus himself, had spoken of two Sacraments.

On the Anglican side the Easterns were reminded that it was clear that the English Church regarded both Confirmation and Orders as Sacraments, because in neither case did we consider that the rite could be repeated: the implication being that we regarded both rites as indelible. The attention of the Orthodox was also called to the fact that the English Church accepted a Roman priest without ordination, but insisted on ordaining a Presbyterian minister.

It was observed by the Orthodox that there were instances in which it seemed to them that our Orders had been accepted by the Eastern Church.

To this the English theologians replied that this was insufficient. What was essential was a clear recognition of Anglican Orders by their Holy Synod.

Such recognition the Eastern priests declared themselves anxious to obtain.

We find all through these criticisms on Anglican Orders the question constantly recurring, Does the Church of England regard Ordination as a Sacrament? It would be difficult to give a clearer answer to this question than that which was given by the historian Döllinger.

When certain Eastern representatives at the Conference in Bonn in 1874 expressed a doubt whether the English Church recognized the sacramental character of Ordination, Dr. Döllinger replied that "one frequent cause of misunderstandings is that the same words can be understood in different ways. An Anglican can answer the question 'Do you hold Orders to be a Sacrament?' with both 'Yes' and 'No.' The English Church uses the word 'Sacrament' in a sense different from that in which the Roman Catholic Church uses the word *Sacramentum*, and the Greek Church the word *mysterion*. The English Church calls 'Sacraments' only those institutions which have been ordained by Christ, as means of grace to all believers. Whether this limitation of the idea is justifiable need not now be discussed. But if the word is taken in this narrow signification, the English Church, in enumerating the Sacraments in her symbolical and liturgical books must omit Ordination, which is intended only for a limited number of persons, not, like Baptism and the Eucharist, for all. But the *word* cannot affect the question. What idea Anglicans attach to the word 'Sacrament,' and whether or no they call Ordination a Sacrament, may be regarded with indifference by the Orientals. What does affect the question is, that Ordination is accompanied by laying-on of hands, that the words in which the conferring of the spiritual grace is expressed are spoken, and that it is believed that a grace of the Holy Spirit is conferred by Ordination. In this respect, English Orders cannot be impugned."[1]

[1] Döllinger in Report of Conference at Bonn, p. 106.

It is, then, no exaggeration to say that the prospects of complete mutual understanding between the Greek Church and the Anglican were never so hopeful as they are at the present time.

We, on our side, ought not to be surprised at their misgivings or offended at their criticisms. It is a thing self-evident, that reunion is a sacred work which requires qualifications and self-preparedness on either side, and certainly not least on our own. It is only reasonable, when challenged to explain what the Anglican conception of the character of Ordination is, that the English Church should give official assurance to the inquiries of the East. As Birkbeck said in words already quoted, it does not seem unreasonable that Eastern bishops and theologians should wish to know in what sense the Anglican bishops themselves regard the Orders which they possess. What would contribute enormously towards complete confidence on the part of the Greeks and to their official acknowledgment of our ministerial succession, would be a clear and definite statement by our own authorities that Anglicans believe ordination to confer an indelible character and grace of the Holy Spirit. If the Lambeth Conference were to frame some resolution of this kind, it would satisfy what Eastern theologians desire to know.

Meanwhile, as throwing official light on the intention of the English Church in Ordination, the Eastern theologians will not forget the reply of the English Archbishops to Pope Leo XIII. in 1896, where it is expressly said in reference to our Ordinal, that "the intention of our Fathers was to keep and continue these offices which came down from the earliest times, and 'reverently to use and esteem them,' in the sense, of course, in which they were received from the Apostles and had been up to that time in use."[1]

REVIEW OF FOUR YEARS

By the Rev. H. J. FYNES-CLINTON

IN the midst of the very black outlook for European civilization and the peace of the world, which are menaced by the terrible anti-Christian movement of Bolshevism and the threat of Islam, by growing industrial unrest, and increasing indifference to the authority of Divine revelation in the Church, there is one result of the war, at least, which has the brightest augury for the future strength of the English Church and for the spread of the Kingdom of Christ in the Near East and Asia.

This is the wonderful growth of intimacy in our relations with the

[1] "Answer of the Archbishops of England to Leo XIII.," § xvii.

Churches of the Near East during the last five years. The way for this had been prepared by much spade work by individuals, by the prayers for promoting the unity of Christendom, by the Eastern Church Association, and, since 1906, chiefly in practical work by the Anglican and Eastern Association. Further, barriers of mutual ignorance and lack of desire for unity, born of long isolation, were broken down by the rough necessities of the war, and our alliances with Russia, Greece, and Roumania roused on both sides more widespread interest in our respective culture and religion. Correspondence and visits of several important prelates and representatives of the Eastern Church to England, and of English and American to the East, made it clear that a recognition had sprung up that closer relations—and, indeed, intercommunion—were not only widely desired, but an urgent need of the times, so full of new anxieties and problems.

In 1906 the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union was founded in order to develop the then existing work of *rapprochement* on the lines, more practical and popular, for which the times seemed to be ripe. The Union succeeded in associating as members, having the common aim of promoting intercourse, knowledge, and co-operation, with the end of intercommunion, Orthodox and Anglicans, among whom are many Russian, Greek, and Assyrian priests and bishops. It cannot be doubted that the atmosphere of interest and friendliness which this Association helped to create did much to prepare the way for the official relations which are now being established. A powerful Branch of the Union was established in the United States and local associations in the Dependencies, and a sister society with a very influential committee was formed on the initiation and with the assistance of the Union in Russia.

Some years ago the Union was amalgamated with the smaller, but older, Eastern Church Association, and became "The Anglican and Eastern Association." The first President was Dr. Collins, Bishop of Gibraltar, who did so much to further the cause and promote valuable relations on intercommunion at the last Lambeth Conference. He was followed by Dr. Blyth, Bishop in Jerusalem, who had established a most wise policy of recognition of the position of the Eastern Church, and of friendly co-operation. The present Bishop of London is the third President. Among our Orthodox Episcopal members and patrons are the great Patriarch and champion of the Russian Church, Tykhon, and six other Russian bishops. Also Archbishop Dimitri of Belgrade, Bishop Nicholai Velimirović, the Archbishop of Athens, the Archbishop of Cyprus, the heads of their respective churches; and other Orthodox prelates, together with some twenty-five Anglican bishops.

English Churchmen are compelled to face their responsibility and the need of understanding our Eastern brethren by the fact that within

the Empire or under British protection there are now the ancient Patriarchates and Churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus and the lands to the East, with new duties to the Syrians, Assyrians, and Armenians.

During the period of the war the Association took in England a leading part in the great increase of intercourse between the Churches of England and our Allies in the Near East. The Bishop of London was officially and very warmly received in Athens and in Salonica, and the liberation of Jerusalem was the occasion of intimate meetings between our Bishop in Jerusalem, the Anglican chaplains, and the Eastern Church authorities.

The ubiquity of our soldiers led to the loan of churches by the Orthodox in Russia—*e.g.*, Libau and Kronstadt—and in Serbia, to our chaplains for services, similar to the very frequent loan of Anglican churches for the Orthodox and other Easterns in America and the Dominions. There was also not infrequent administration of Holy Communion by Orthodox clergy, both to Anglicans dying and to those isolated from English ministrations.

SERBIANS IN ENGLAND.

This advance was more marked, however, in England itself owing to the presence of some six hundred refugee boys and young men, chiefly under the Serbian Relief Fund. These were placed in hostels in different parts of England and Scotland. They learned that the English Church was their friend. When exiled from their own land, they were invited to celebrate their own National Anniversary of Kossovo Field by a great service in St. Paul's Cathedral, at which the Archbishop of Canterbury addressed a message full of hope and sympathy. No one present will ever forget the moving sound of their young voices singing their National Hymn before the assembled representatives of the Allied nations and those who had toiled and fought for the rescue of Serbia. The Secretary of the Association, with the help of the Bishop of London, the President, co-operated in securing as far as possible that they should be under the spiritual care of Serbian and, in their absence, of Anglican priests. In most cases they regularly attended the parish churches and often received religious instruction from the parish clergy. Frequently the Serbian Liturgy was celebrated for them in English and Scottish churches, and the Chapel of the House of Charity, Soho, was kindly lent by the Sisters and permission given by the Bishop for its permanent use for the Serbian services. The Holy Sacraments have been administered to them by Anglican priests. These arrangements were made under the written authority and request of the Rev. Father Nicholai Velimirović, who was officially in spiritual charge of the refugees.

BISHOP NICHOLAI VELIMIROVIĆ.

This monk-priest, who had studied in various Continental universities, and had been Royal Chaplain during the Balkan Wars, and Professor in the Seminary at Belgrade, arrived from travels in America during the early part of the war, and, while in residence for the greater part of the time, from 1915 to 1918, aroused the sympathy of the English nation in a wonderful way, and brought to them an understanding of the Serbian people. By his personality, his writings, lectures, and sermons, he promoted our present close relations with the Serbian Church. He soon got into touch with the Secretary and Committee of the Association and there followed the unprecedented permission from the Bishop of London, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other English and Scottish diocesans, to an Orthodox priest to deliver addresses and sermons in our churches. He preached in a large number of parish churches throughout the country, and also in the Cathedrals of London, Manchester, Birmingham, Southwark, Oxford, Peterborough, Edinburgh, Winchester, Aberdeen, and others. It was recognized that there was some danger that this practice might lead to a claim on the part of others to permission for dissenters to preach in the pulpits of the Church, but it was felt that this need not be taken into serious account owing to the essential difference in the two cases, the former being a consequence of the principle of Apostolic Succession, the other a contravention of it. It would be impossible to give a list of the numerous occasions on which he spoke to all kinds of audiences, but of the last and most striking was the profound and memorable address which he gave before the Vice-Chancellor and University of London in King's College, in December, 1919, on the "Spiritual Rebirth of Europe."

Another notable step was made in the permission accorded by the Bishop of London to Father Nicholai and the Serbian priests to celebrate their Liturgy in the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside, on June 28, 1918, at which Dr. Bury, Bishop for North and Central Europe, preached, and the Lord Mayor and Corporation attended in State. This, and similar celebrations in the Cathedral at Birmingham and so many other churches, marked an historic advance in our relations, which must have permanent results.

VISITS OF EASTERN CHURCHMEN.

But still more fruitful was the unique series of visits to England by Orthodox prelates and priests that took place during the war. Archbishop Dimitri, the Metropolitan of Belgrade, was received by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, and paid a visit to the Serbian students at Oxford. An illuminated address was pre-

sented to him by the Association and friends in Sion College. Visits followed by Bishop Barnabas of Monastir, the Greek Archbishop of Trebizond, and the Archbishop of Cyprus. The latter was resident for many months in London on a political mission, and took the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the English Church and many of her clergy, attending services in the Cathedral, the Abbey, and several churches, and the anniversary of the Association. The visit of the Vicar-Bishop of Carlović, the Serbian Archiepiscopal See in Hungary, with Archdeacon Irenæ, now a Bishop in Serbia, was of great importance in opening friendly intercourse with the northern independent section of the Church of Jugo-Slavia, which has now attained reunion with the Church of Serbia and Montenegro. By this Bishop was celebrated the first Pontifical Liturgy in an English church; in St. Augustine's, Queen's Gate, and again in the Church of the Cowley Fathers at Oxford. Beside this we had Father Voyislav Janic, who took a leading part in our work with Father Nicholai and in the care of the Serbian students; Father Cicerone Jordaschescu, the Roumanian priest in charge in Paris, and Father Leluchin, on a mission from Archangel. For all of these the Secretary arranged opportunities for visiting the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, Bishop Bury, and leading members of the clergy, religious houses, and such institutions as the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, the British and Foreign Bible Society, Oxford House, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Oxford University, Windsor, etc.

Perhaps still more important, because fully official, was the visit of Archishop Meletius of Athens, who, following a visit to the Church in America, came to acquaint himself with the conditions and leaders of Church life in this country. A great service of supplication for our Eastern brethren, still suffering and in danger under Turkish rule, and for their final liberation, together with thanksgiving for the freeing of the Holy Land, was arranged by the Association in the Cathedral of St. Paul on October 26, 1918. The Archbishop of Athens, vested in mántia and mitre and attended by his suite and by the Archimandrite Pagonis and other clergy of the Greek Church in London, took part in the procession, and stood at the altar for the Te Deum, at the end praying in Greek for reunion, and giving his blessing at the choir steps. A similar service was held on December 18, 1919, in St. Paul's, at which Father Nicholai Velimirović, now consecrated Bishop of Žiča, in Serbia, took the same part, but also officiated at the Te Deum and delivered a sermon on unity. Among those who took part in the procession was the Vatoped, the Prelate of the Armenian Church in England.

CONFERENCES.

During certain of these visits opportunity was taken on the initiation of the Anglican and Eastern Association to hold conferences between Anglicans and the Orthodox. In the United States an important conference had been arranged with the Archbishop of Athens by the American Branch of the Association, chiefly on Holy Baptism, Holy Orders, and the Filioque Clause. At Oxford, subsequently, was held a preliminary conference, summoned by Dr. Headlam, of English theologians. A second, under the chairmanship of Dr. Headlam, Regius Professor, with Father Jordaschescu (Roumanian), Father Janić (Serb), and other Orthodox. The third, under the same chairmanship, was held with the Archbishop of Athens, Dr. Chrysostom Papadopoulos, and Professor Alivizatos, of Athens University, Father Callinicos, of Manchester, and other Greeks, and a very representative company of Anglican theologians. These conferences were chiefly concerned with baptism, confirmation, and the granting of Holy Communion to those who were travelling or dying, and the general agreement was that there was little bar on either side to the granting of such mutual administrations. The fourth conference was held in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey, with the same Greeks, under the presidency of the Bishop of Winchester, at which the question of the Seventh General Council and the Worship of Icons was discussed and agreement reached. The general outcome of these conferences has been to increase the likelihood of fruitful conferences of the same kind in the near future, and it is indeed hoped that in the mutual administration of the sacraments and practical intercommunion an important advance is about to be made. A detailed account of these conferences will shortly be published in book form.

THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS.

The invasion of Serbia had as a result the closing and partial destruction of the two seminaries of the Orthodox Church at Belgrade and Prizrend. Five hundred students were scattered, some into military service, some into captivity, and many to death. Many arrived in France as refugees, but while the French Government made liberal provision for the education of the Serbian boys in all other professions and trades, it could not recognize the vocation to the priesthood, and the seminarists were obliged at the most critical time of their preparation to devote themselves to other work. Here was a plain and urgent call to the Church in England, and the Anglican and Eastern Association, in concert with Father Nicholai, brought over five picked students and settled them in St. Stephen's House, Oxford, under the care of the late Principal, Father Bown, whose spiritual influence over young men

was remarkable. Here we planned that they should be trained for the ministry, and the result seemed so satisfactory that, in October, 1916, an appeal was put out for funds in order to maintain a larger number. Several more were sent by the authorities of the Serbian Church, and in addition, an appeal was made by Archbishop Dimitri to the Archbishop of Canterbury that we should rescue from their unsatisfactory surroundings and in a similar way take care of a number of young seminary boys. Although this was an increase of our proposed responsibility, we invited them over, and, to meet the new need, the Association initiated a Public Council, which, with the help of Canon Carnegie, was formed under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the chairmanship of Lord Salisbury, with the Revs. H. J. Fynes-Clinton and E. St. G. Schomberg as secretaries. Under this Council some fifty of the younger seminarists were maintained in the Theological Colleges of Cuddesdon and Dorchester, under the Rev. J. B. Seaton and the Rev. C. P. Hankey and some Serbian professors. At the beginning of 1919 most of these seminarists returned to Serbia after passing their examinations. Meanwhile, the Oxford students had been placed under the care, at St. Stephen's House, of Father Frere and Father Hallward, and for academical purposes under a committee of tutors, with Dr. Headlam as chairman. The original five have returned to Serbia, four with excellent results in examination for the degree of Bachelor of Letters in Theology. Last autumn, owing to the failure of the Council to raise sufficient funds, the Anglican and Eastern Association resumed its responsibility, and it now maintains in residence thirteen picked students for the same degree, in its own hostel of SS. Sava and George, Parks Road, Oxford, with, as Principal, the Rev. R. M. French, late Vice-Principal of Dorchester and Chaplain at Petrograd. The students have opportunities, not only to train themselves for meeting the serious problems that exist in Serbia, owing to the influx of rationalism and the likelihood of Western sectarian influence, but also of seeing during the vacations English methods of pastoral, educational, evangelic and social work among the people, and of clerical and monastic life, from which they hope to gather something that may be of use to them in the great part they must play, many as bishops and professors, in the reconstruction of the devastated life of their Church and nation.

Several Greek theological students have also arrived in Oxford, and are living in lodgings, but the hostel system is very preferable for Eastern students, and it is hoped that both for these and some Roumanians who are expected, we may find sufficient financial help to enable us permanently to maintain a larger hostel for students for the priesthood from all the Orthodox Churches.

Funds are urgently required for the continuing of this work, which is not only of urgent importance for the future ministry of the Serbian

Church and the men themselves, but is pregnant with the greatest possibilities for our relations with the whole Orthodox Communion. Donations for this object will be gratefully received by the Secretary of the Association, the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, 27, Finsbury Square, E.C. 2.

Official Relations.

The whole position with regard to intercourse with the Eastern Churches is profoundly changed since the beginning of the war, and advances as described above are *faits accomplis*, which can never be rescinded. We seem to be on the eve of the establishment of permanent official relations. For at Constantinople there has been established a Committee of Reunion which deals with the question of the Anglican Church among others. In Serbia there is a similar commission, and the Metropolitan of Athens sends a message to the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Holy Synod has instituted a permanent committee composed of Professors of Athens University, presided over by the Archimandrite Chrysostom Papadopoulos, for relations with the English Church. His Beatitude has also instituted a professorial chair of the English Church in Athens University, which it is hoped will be filled alternately by Greek and Anglican theologians.

At the end of last year the Archbishop of Canterbury instituted a permanent Official Committee of Relations with the Eastern Churches, of which Dr. Gore is chairman and the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton secretary, and this committee is about to undertake serious study and work.

The Christians of Turkey.

Other work in which the Association has co-operated or taken the lead was the formation of a Public Committee for the Redemption of the Church of Santa Sophia, and this is still working and keeping a watch to promote the restoration of this second cathedral of Christendom to Christian worship as an act of justice necessary to the future peace of the world, and as a symbol of the liberation and resurrection to new life of our Christian brethren lying under the barbarous and bloody despotism of the Turk. Many services of intercession have been held and appeals issued for these and for the Armenians.

The secretary also, in order to represent the ecclesiastical aspect of our international relations, accepted places on the committees of the Serbian Relief Fund, the Serbian Society, the Anglo-Roumanian Society, and the United Russia Societies Association.

A joint committee was formed in January, 1920, by the Anglican and Eastern Association and the Russian Parish Church Council in London to aid in establishing a parish institute for religious, educational and social work, to meet the needs of more than 1,500 Orthodox

refugees flying from the terror and persecution in Russia. The Rev. Canon J. H. B. Masterman, with the permission of the Bishop of London and approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, has offered to the Russian Colony the regular use of the church of St. Mary-le-Bow for their Sunday services, as they need one larger than their present small embassy chapel.

THE S.P.C.K. AND THE SERBIAN CHURCH

By the Rev. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE

THE Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has been interested in Eastern Church affairs ever since its beginning, but until the great war broke out had taken no special cognizance of Serbia.

In September, 1917, it was represented to the Society that the Serbian soldiers were in a state of spiritual destitution, so far as literature went, and that the Serbian authorities would greatly appreciate the kindness if something could be provided by S.P.C.K. in the way of a prayer book, just as the Bible Society provided Bibles. The cases were not quite parallel: the Bible Society provided what was common to both English and Serbs; the S.P.C.K. was being asked to produce a book of Eastern Church devotions, such as would inevitably be contrary to Anglican formularies in some respects. However, the Committee consented to help, and Father Nicolai Velimirović compiled a book of prayers in Serbian, which was probably an advance on anything produced before in Serbia. Several beautiful pictures of churches and ikons were included, and to many a Serbian exile the book must have seemed like a breath of air from home. The Serbian Relief Fund assisted in the distribution of the books, which went to the Western Front, Archangel, Bizerta, Corfu, and Salonica; 10,000 copies in all were disposed of.

At the end of 1918 the way was open for a return of the exiles. On arriving in Serbia the ecclesiastical authorities found that the invaders had destroyed most of the Church-service books. A further appeal for help was made to S.P.C.K. The Society consulted its president, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and, helped by his advice, drew up the following scheme for meeting the urgent need:

1. *A Reprint of the Book of Prayers.*—A further 10,000 were printed and sent to Serbia through the Serbian Relief Fund. Unfortunately, they were shipped to Fiume, where for a long while they remained.

2. *A Serbian Edition of Philaret's (Russian) Orthodox Catechism.*—The translation was made by Father Yanitch, with the assistance of Mr. Georgevitch. Two thousand copies were printed and sent to Serbia, but they were stopped, like the foregoing, at Fiume.

3. *Service Books.*—A more ambitious project was the production of service books. The Slavonic Liturgy (Slusvenik) and Office Book (Trebnik) were imported from Russia before the war. Things being as they are, there was no possibility of getting new ones. Therefore copies, which chanced to be in England, were photographed page by page, and from the photographic blocks "electros" were made, from which the books were printed off. A consignment of 850 Liturgies left Liverpool at the end of November, and should have no difficulty in getting through to their destination and proving to our Serbian friends that we have not forgotten them.

The inscription in the books is: "Presented by Members of the Church of England to the Church of Serbia." We hope some of the books at least will survive to a remote future, and be treasured as a memorial of the increased understanding between the two Churches which arose out of the war.

REVIEW

Serbia: Her People, History, and Aspirations. By Woislav M. Petrovitch, Attaché to the Royal Serbian Legation to the Court of St. James. 1915.

As the title indicates, the author is concerned chiefly with the political aspect of Serbian life, but the religious aspect is included. The work is a tragic record of sufferings borne with amazing fortitude.

Of the ecclesiastical life we read: "The Serbian Church is autonomous, but maintains a close union, in the matter of dogma, with the Greek or Eastern Orthodox Church. The internal control belongs to the Assembly of Bishops, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Belgrade, who is at the same time the Metropolitan of Serbia."[1]

Here is a characteristic passage on Stephan Nemanya, the famous founder of a great Serbian dynasty. After a reign of indomitable energy, "feeling the weakness of advancing age, and wishing to give fresh proof to his people of his religious faith, the aged Nemanya abdicated in 1196 in favour of his able second son, Stephan, and withdrew to the Convent of Hilendar on Mount Athos, the prior of which was his third son, Rastko, who has remained famous in the Serbian Church under the name of St. Sava, and continues to watch over his people."[2]

The mingling of religion with social festivities is very interestingly described. Every Serbian family keeps its own yearly festival, with invited guests, at which the head of the family takes a censer and lets the fragrance rise before the ikon. Then he holds the censer before each guest. "That ceremony being ended, and if there be no priest present, the host himself invites his guests to engage in prayer. A great many Serbian peasants are gifted with the power of offering extempore prayer, and they are always in request at these ceremonies. The host passes the censer to his wife, whose duty it is to see that the fumes of the incense reach into every part of the house. Next the host breaks silence with the following prayer: 'Let us pray, O brethren, most reverently to the Almighty Lord our God, and to the Holy Trinity. O Lord, Thou omnipotent and gracious Creator of Heaven and Earth, deliver us, we pray Thee, from all unforeseen evil. O St. George [here he adds the name of the saint whose festival they are celebrating], our holy patron-saint, protect us and plead for us with the Lord our God, we here gathered together do pray Thee. Ye Holy Apostles, ye, the four Evangelists and pillars upon whom rest the Heavens and Earth, we, being sinners, do conjure you to intercede for us. . . .' When his prayer is finished, the guests make the sign of the cross several times, and then supper begins."[3]

[1] P. 28. [2] P. 51. [3] P. 259.

AMERICAN BISHOPS' MESSAGE TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has received the following telegram from Bishop Burch, of New York, on behalf of 100 American Bishops:

We are grateful for your leadership in crusade against proposed retention of Turks in Constantinople and spoliation of Armenia. Any compromise with Turks will be condonation of crime, and will outrage conscience of Christendom. We believe Armenia, landlocked and robbed of her fairest portions, cannot achieve real independence or self-support. We respectfully but energetically protest against proposed measures, and appeal to the people of Great Britain to prevent the perpetuation of a fresh act of injustice against Martyr Armenia. American people have always placed implicit faith in the pledges of Great Britain. We cannot believe Great Britain will disappoint us by failing to do full justice to Armenia.

To this the Archbishop has replied as follows:

After consultation am glad to assure American Bishops of my continued and cordial sympathy in measures to secure safety, independence, and freedom of worship to all Christian races hitherto subjected to Turkey. Question of best means to attain this object is receiving most careful consideration of British Government in concert with their Allies. We have counted on America's co-operation in this matter, and hope we may feel assured that she will bear her part in protection of oppressed Eastern nationalities.

The Holy Synod of the Church of Constantinople in a telegram to the Archbishop of Canterbury asks him

To fortify in energetic fashion the Government of Britain, the country actuated before all others by great and liberal principles, in their efforts to drive out the Turks. By this complete and final expulsion, though by no other means, can be secured the resurrection of Christianity in the Near East and the restoration of the Church of St. Sophia.

The telegram is signed by Dorotheus, Archbishop of Brousa, *locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Patriarchate; Nicholas, Archbishop of Charia; Constantine, Archbishop of Cyzicus; Germanus, Archbishop of Amaissia; Gerassimus, Archbishop of Pissidia; Gervassius, Archbishop of Angora; Anthimus, Archbishop of Viza; Joachim, Archbishop of Enos; Eugenus, Archbishop of Sylivria; Agathangeluv, Archbishop of Santa Ecclission; Chrysostom, Archbishop of Tsorlu; and Irineus, Archbishop of Dardanelles.

The Archbishop in reply assures them of his intense anxiety to secure that the Christian peoples and the Holy Orthodox Church of the East should be permanently freed from the Turkish yoke, and says that he has already appealed to the British Government:

You may rely on Church of England doing everything possible to aid Your Beatitude and Orthodox Bishops in working for deliverance of oppressed races and renewal of Christianity in the Near East.—*Times*, Wednesday, March 3, 1920.

I

Mo

cer
wh
my
Cy
Me
the
co

pr
th
Gr
of
de
Cl
th
m

gr
w
pa
C
n
p
c
M